

The Assembly met at 13:30.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Mr. Kwiatkowski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by a number of Saskatchewan citizens to present a petition on their behalf. These are citizens who are concerned about the state of health care in the province of Saskatchewan and are wishing to suggest alternate solutions to the government, primarily in the funding area. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to induce the provincial government to instruct Saskatchewan lotteries and the Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority to begin to appropriate 25 per cent of all profits towards provincial health care needs.

And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

There are 1,075 signatures on this petition, Mr. Speaker. And it is signed by citizens of Birch Hills, Nipawin, Codette, and numerous other communities including Rocanville, Moosomin, Weyburn, and other communities around the province.

I so present, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Ms. Draude: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I again present a petition on people who are opposed to the Kyoto accord.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to immediately take all necessary action to protect our province's economy and work to halt the federal government's intent to sign on to the Kyoto accord in its current form.

The people who have signed this petition are from Naicam, Lake Lenore, and Spalding.

Mr. Bjornerud: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a petition to present today to ensure the responsible use of natural resources by all citizens. The prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to work with the federal government, First Nations representatives, and with other provincial governments to bring about a resolution in the Lake of the Prairies situation and to ensure that our natural resources as a whole are used in a responsible manner by all people in the future.

The signatures, Mr. Speaker, are from the communities of Churchbridge, Russell, Esterhazy, Bredenbury, and Langenburg.

Mr. Stewart: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to present a petition signed by citizens concerned with the negative effect signing the Kyoto accord may have on the Saskatchewan economy. And the prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to immediately take all necessary action to protect our province's economy and work to halt the federal government's intent to sign on to the Kyoto accord in its current form.

This petition is signed by individuals all from the community of Naicam.

I so present.

Mr. Elhard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again today I have a petition asking the provincial government to resist signing on to the Kyoto accord. The prayer reads as follows, Mr. Speaker:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to take the necessary actions to protect our province's economy by working to halt the federal government's intent to sign on to the Kyoto accord in its current form.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by residents of Maple Creek, Swift Current, and Fox Valley.

I so present.

Ms. Eagles: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I too have a petition signed by concerned citizens in my constituency regarding the Kyoto accord. And the prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to take the necessary actions to protect our province's economy by working to halt the federal government's intent to sign on to the Kyoto accord in its present form.

And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

And this is signed by my constituents from Bienfait, Macoun, and Estevan.

I so present. Thank you.

Mr. McMorris: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have a petition to present on behalf of citizens of the province regarding the Kyoto Protocol. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to immediately take all necessary actions to protect our province's economy and work to halt the

federal government's intent to sign on to the Kyoto accord in its current form.

Mr. Speaker, these people that have signed this petition are from Quill Lake, Naicam, and Spalding.

I so present.

Ms. Bakken: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to present a petition on behalf of the constituents of Weyburn-Big Muddy who are especially concerned about the devastating effects Kyoto will have on our constituency. And the prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to take the necessary actions to protect our province's economy by working to halt the federal government's intent to sign on to the Kyoto accord in its current form.

And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

And I have several petitions, Mr. Speaker, and they are signed by residents of Saskatoon, Weyburn, Regina; Calgary, High River, Alberta; Kirkella; Vancouver; Brooks, Alberta; Roblin, Manitoba; Spruce Grove, Alberta; Bienfait, Radville, Bengough, Big Beaver, and more from Bengough.

I so present.

Mr. Wall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise again on behalf of concerned residents of southwest Saskatchewan on the issue of Kyoto. The prayer of their petition reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to take the necessary steps to protect our province's economy by working to halt the federal government's intent to sign on to the Kyoto accord in its current form.

And, Mr. Speaker, the petitioners today are from the city of Swift Current, and the communities in the Southwest of Pambun and Wymark.

I so present.

Mr. Huyghebaert: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, again I rise with a petition from citizens in my constituency that are very concerned about the economic impact that Kyoto may have on the province of Saskatchewan. And the petition reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to take the necessary actions to protect our province's economy by working to halt the federal government's intent to sign on to the Kyoto accord in its current form.

And as is duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

And, Mr. Speaker, this is signed by the good citizens of McCord and Mankota.

I so present.

Mr. Brkich: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also have a petition signed by many citizens worried about the Kyoto accord.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to take the necessary actions to protect our province's economy by working to halt the federal government's intent to sign on to the Kyoto accord in its current form.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Signed by many citizens from the town of Davidson.

I so present.

Mr. Weekes: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also have a petition from citizens concerned about the Kyoto accord. The prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to take the necessary actions to protect the province's economy by working to halt the federal government's intent to sign on to the Kyoto accord in its current form.

And as is duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Signed by the good citizens of North Battleford, Shellbrook, and Biggar.

I so present.

Ms. Harpauer: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I too have a petition of citizens concerned about the Kyoto accord. And the prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to take the necessary actions to protect our province's economy by working to halt the federal government's intent to sign on to the Kyoto accord in its current form.

And the petitioners, Mr. Speaker, are from the community of Davidson, the city of Regina, and from Vancouver, British Columbia.

I so present.

Mr. Hart: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of constituents who are very concerned about this government's inability to develop a mechanism to change the boundaries of the regional health authorities. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon.

Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to take the necessary action to ensure the best possible health care coverage for the communities of Govan, Duval, Strasbourg, and Bulyea by placing those communities in Regina Regional Health Authority as opposed to the Saskatoon Regional Health Authority.

As in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

Signatures to this petition, Mr. Speaker, come from the community of Strasbourg.

I so present.

Mr. Allchurch: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in the Assembly today to bring forth a petition signed by citizens of Saskatchewan concerned with the signing on to the Kyoto accord. And the prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to immediately take all necessary action to protect the province's economy and to work to halt the federal government's intent to sign on to the Kyoto accord in its current form.

And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

And the signatures, Mr. Speaker, on this petition are from the centre of Rose Valley.

I so present.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Deputy Clerk: — According to order the following petitions have been reviewed and hereby received as addendums to previously tabled petitions being sessional papers nos. 11 and 437.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING, SELECT AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills

Ms. Hamilton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before moving concurrence in the seventh report of the Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills, I would draw the Assembly's attention to the items that were discussed and recommended.

Your committee met to examine the petition of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool for a private member's Bill to amend The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool Act, 1995. The committee finds that rules 65 and 68, that deal with public advertising requirements and fees, have been fully complied with.

However rule 64 that requires the petitioner to file their request by the 20th sitting day of the session could not be complied with at this time as this fall session began on day 79 as a continuation of the spring session.

In order to consider the Bill at the fall session rather than delaying the Bill until spring of 2003, your committee

recommends that provisions of rule 64 be waived in this case.

Pursuant to rule 84, your committee further recommends that the timelines laid down in rules 81 . . . 71 to 83 be modified to enable consideration and passage of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool amending Bill by December 18, 2002.

With those recommendations, Mr. Speaker, I now move:

That the seventh report of the Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills be now concurred in.

Moved by myself and seconded by the member from Arm River.

Motion agreed to.

The Clerk: — As the assembled members have just heard, petition 304 of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool has been favourably reported on and pursuant to rule 71, private Bill No. 304, An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool Act, 1995, is deemed to have been introduced and read the first time.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 304 — The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool Amendment Act, 2002

Ms. Jones: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, before asking leave of the Assembly to move second reading, I'd like to make a few brief remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the Assembly has petitioned, and I have agreed as a private member to sponsor Bill 304 and to pilot it through the House. As explained to the committee in this morning's meeting, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool is asking for consideration at this time because the normal process would delay consideration for at least another six months and perhaps even longer.

Bill 304 would give delegates the authority to make changes to their company's governance and structure, changes that they would deem to be in the best interests of their members, shareholders, and co-operative and in a time frame that more accurately reflects the speed of change within the business community.

In passing Bill 304, this Assembly would enable the movement of specific provisions and associated authorities from the Wheat Pool Act to the Pool's bylaws, giving them greater control to make future changes without having to seek legislative approval.

And so, Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, I move, pursuant to the seventh report of the Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills:

That private Bill No. 304, An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool Act, 1995, be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills.

Leave granted.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a second time and, by leave of the Assembly, referred to the Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills.

(13:45)

NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

Mr. Allchurch: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on day no. 86 ask the government the following question:

To the Minister of Industry and Resources: is it the 2002 policy of the provincial government to advise or require the FMA partners to take only hardwood forest products from the provincial forest; if this policy is in place, is it designed to increase stumpage income for the province; if not, what would be the reason?

And I have also a question for the Minister of Environment.

I also have another question. I give notice that I shall on day 86 ask the government the following question:

To the Minister of Justice: what is the status of the proposed TLE land negotiation between Pelican Lake First Nations and the Crown regarding the area west of Big River in the Otter Lake area; have third party interests been represented in these negotiations and what have been the results of those third party representations, if any; what is the provincial government's position regarding the Carlton Trail which passes through the proposed TLE land?

And I have also questions for the Minister of Highways and the Minister of Government Relations.

Thank you.

Mr. Weekes: — Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on day no. 86 ask the government the following question:

To the Minister of Labour: how many employers in the province who have 10 employees or more currently do not have health and safety committees set up?

Mr. Brkich: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on day no. 86 ask the government the following question:

To the Agriculture minister: has the Government of Saskatchewan made its full financial commitment 2001 CFIB and NISA program?

And while I'm on my feet, I will submit a question:

To the minister responsible for Sask Water: what is the current status of Sask Water lawsuits involving IPSCO; if the matter has been resolved, what were the terms of the settlement?

I so present.

Mr. Dearborn: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on day no. 86 ask the government the following question:

To the Labour minister: for the year 2001, how many people applied for workmen's compensation for stress leave due to mental illness; further to that, how many people were granted stress leave upon application; and finally, how many files upon initial date of application exceeded the two-year window?

Mr. Speaker, I have further questions along the same line that date back to 1996 through 2001 inclusive.

Ms. Harpauer: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on day no. 86 ask the government the following question:

To the Minister of Agriculture: how many winter bull-feeding stations are there in the province of Saskatchewan; and of those, how many cut their own feed?

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You and all members will have noticed that a large number of guests are gathered in your gallery today, Mr. Speaker. They will be more formally acknowledged later in proceedings today during ministerial statements, but I do want to welcome today the entire Queen's Golden Jubilee Committee and representatives of other royal organizations in our province who have worked very hard this year to celebrate the Queen's Golden Jubilee in our province.

And I want to equally welcome the president of the Indian Federated College and mayors from the cities of Prince Albert, Lloydminster, Regina, and Moose Jaw.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we will be more formally introducing our guests later today but I would invite all members now to give a warm welcome to our guests in the Speaker's gallery.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Eagles: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition I would like to join the Premier in welcoming the guests from the Queen's Golden Jubilee Committee and all the other royal organizations that are here, as well as the other guests that he had previously mentioned. I hope your stay is enjoyable and safe and we look forward to meeting with you perhaps later. Thank you.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As well I welcome our guests and I'll be visiting with you after we're done in the legislature.

But I want to introduce to the House a group of people who are joining us from northern Saskatchewan, and I'm going to explain a little bit about them before I mention their names and I'll get them to stand.

Both COGEMA and Cameco as active corporate citizens in the North brought together what's called the community vitality project. And the community vitality project was about northern youth taking leadership in helping to identify opportunities for

their community, taking positive action in their communities.

Now I don't know if you know, Mr. Speaker, but 60 per cent of the population of the North are youth. So even whether they chose to be proactive or not, they will be the people who are making these decisions. And it is . . . I like their definition of leadership. It's about identifying positive action for their community. And I certainly want to commend COGEMA and Cameco for the resources that they've devoted towards this project.

The youth visiting with us today who met with several of the ministers — and I must say provided very practical information that will be helpful in decision making — if I could get you to stand: Brennan Merasty, Chris Hansen, Tiffany McKay, Bernadette Knox; Walter Smith from Cameco, Alan Richards from Cameco, and Don Hovdebo has been a facilitator throughout this whole process and did a terrific job on that.

So please join me in welcoming these representatives from their communities.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stewart: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to add my voice as well to welcome the students from northern Saskatchewan, and Mr. Richards and Mr. Smith from Cameco. It's very appropriate that they are accompanying the northern students here. Cameco and COGEMA are huge employers in northern Saskatchewan and we commend them on this initiative.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to rise today to introduce to you and through you to all members of this House, a very special guest who's seated in your gallery.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce my constituent, Mr. John — or J.D. — Mollard, a very well-known Saskatchewanian and an internationally respected geotechnical researcher and consultant. Mr. Mollard is accompanied by his wife, Mary Jean. I'm also introducing him on behalf of the Minister of Highways and Transportation.

Mr. Mollard just recently received his investiture into the Order of Canada. He was recognized for his work as a pioneer in remote sensing and terrain analysis. As president of J.D. Mollard and Associates, he's made major contributions to the interpretation and mapping of the earth's physical geography, its natural resources, and its geo-environment.

His innovative work both in airborne and satellite remote sensing technology has had far-reaching implications in many disciplines, including transportation and engineering, as well as in agriculture and geological applications.

Mr. Mollard is highly regarded by academia, industry, and government, and he's an outstanding international lecturer who is generous with his time and knowledge.

The Order of Canada is awarded to Canadians who have made a recognizable difference to the country, and Mr. Mollard joins an

elite group of 4,000 Canadians who've been awarded this honour, including six others who've just received this honour recently — Sharon Butala from Eastend, John Boucher from St. Louis, David Kaplan from the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon, Harold MacKay from Regina, Ian Wilson, our former provincial archivist, and Roy Atkinson.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, on November 21 of this year, Mr. Mollard was also awarded the prestigious Lieutenant Governor of Saskatchewan Meritorious Achievement Award, presented by the Lieutenant Governor on behalf of the Consulting Engineers of Saskatchewan.

I ask all members of the House to please recognize and welcome John — J.D. — Mollard and his wife, Mary Jean Mollard.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — Mr. Speaker, it's also my pleasure to welcome in the west gallery, 26 students from St. Pius School in my constituency. They're accompanied by their teacher, Ms. Elizabeth Stephenson, as well as parents Wendy Englot, Pam Kujawa, and Rosemary Williams. And this is part of their neighbourhood and part of learning what it's like to be part of the Regina Lakeview constituency.

And I'd ask all members to welcome them here.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hart: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the official opposition I'd like to join with the member from Regina in congratulating Mr. Mollard on receiving his award. I had the pleasure of being in attendance at the Consulting Engineers annual banquet in Saskatoon earlier last month and Mr. Mollard also received an award from that association. And so I say, congratulations.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hillson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to introduced to you, seated in your gallery, Janet Ledingham, and I'd ask her to stand. Janet is a successful business person, farmer, and municipal leader. She's also the nominated Liberal candidate in Weyburn-Big Muddy.

Now of course because on Monday we introduced the new constituency boundaries and that constituency no longer exists, she will now have to choose a new constituency in the Southeast in which to run. And I know this will have several MLAs (Member of the Legislative Assembly) in the Southeast extremely nervous and I can understand if the MLAs from the Southeast are reluctant to welcome her to the legislature.

But I'd ask that at least all other MLAs join me in welcoming Janet to the legislature this afternoon.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Belanger: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to join my colleague, the minister of culture and sport and recreation, in welcoming the northern leaders, and to also publicly thank

Cameco and COGEMA for their fine work in working with the northern leaders, and to point out that these are the young individuals that travelled many, many miles to be here today and they are the people that are going to be leading the renaissance of northern Saskatchewan as a community overall.

And I would point out that many of them are actively involved in sport. One of them of course has been involved with planning the cleanup of some northern mines — Ms. Knox has been actively involved with that.

We talked about some of Tiffany's background as a basketball coach, and we often talk about Chris being heavily involved in sport.

And, Mr. Speaker, as you know, the last individual, he is from Ile-a-la-Crosse. His name is Brennan. And Brennan's a hockey player by trade and he's a goalie. And last time I took a shot at him, Mr. Speaker, Brennan of course went like this and the puck hit him here. So there's quite a bit of junk on my shot, Mr. Speaker, and he did manage to save that, so he's a pretty good goalie.

I want to point out that I was pretty happy that they're here today and I'd like to welcome them here as well.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Bakken: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the Legislative Assembly, Angie Roe who is with us today, who . . . Angie lives in the city of Regina and is seeking the nomination in Regina Elphinstone-Centre on behalf of the Saskatchewan Party. Angie is out working very hard in her constituency, meeting people and groups, and she is looking forward to winning the nomination and also taking her place in the Legislative Assembly following the next provincial election.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Bakken: — Mr. Speaker, if I might I would also like to welcome Janet Ledingham from the constituency of Weyburn-Big Muddy to the Assembly today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Well, members, I'd just like to add my welcome to all of our visitors and guests in the Assembly today, particularly the students, the young people from the North; the mayors, including my own mayor, Mayor Cody, who is here today.

And I want to extend a special welcome to the committee for the Queen's Golden Jubilee who have been working hard all year. And I understand that they've brought with them the congratulatory register which will be mailed to Her Majesty. And if there's anybody in this building or any guest to this building who wishes to sign, they may do so in the rotunda today.

(14:00)

Mr. Goulet: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is indeed my pleasure to add my words along with my fellow colleagues to, of course, the students from northern Saskatchewan and also to President Eber Hampton.

Mr. Speaker, when they did the presentation this morning I was very impressed in regards to the need for science development, the respect for culture, but also that they did it in both English and Cree. So with that respect, I would like to say:

(The hon. member spoke for a time in Cree.)

Mr. Speaker, again I would like to say in Cree the final word — Ta wow — to them; a special welcome to Eber Hampton and the students from the North.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Globe and Mail Job Creation Article

Mr. Forbes: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Who knows that Saskatchewan is wide open to the future for those who dream big, plan well, and work hard? Well I know it; the Premier knows it; everyone on this side of the House knows it.

Who else knows it? Well for openers, how about the record number of 489,000 people working hard, dreaming big, and planning well. And as we knew it would, the word is getting out.

I refer you to Monday's *Globe and Mail*, Canada's national paper. Specifically I refer you to a business column by Bruce Little called "Amazing facts." The column is about the national job search in the first 11 months of this year, a national 3.3 per cent increase since last December. That's good news for Canada.

Now let me quote Mr. Little. He says:

Where can we find the jobs that have been popping up like spring crocuses . . . (this) year?

Begin with the provinces. Five have exceeded the national gain of 3.3 per cent . . .

Despite their economic woes this year with agriculture and forestry . . . Saskatchewan leads the way with 5.5 per cent job gain . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Forbes: — Alberta could do no better than to match the national average of 3.3 per cent. Saskatchewan will be satisfied once again with leading the way.

Mr. Speaker, the Sask Party has a slogan. This government has a plan and it's working. Our future is wide open. Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Nipawin's Order of the Royal Purple Celebrates 60th Anniversary

Mr. Kwiatkowski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in early November Nipawin's Order of the Royal Purple celebrated their 60th anniversary at the Nipawin Elks Hall. The Nipawin chapter of the Royal Purple was established on November 15, 1942.

The Royal Purple has a long history of helping Nipawin and area residents. Over the years they have assisted in war efforts, delivered meals, hosted teas and entertainment at the seniors' hall, and have donated their time and resources to many charitable events.

They meet needs locally by donating to the nursing home and hospitals, sporting events, parks, scholarships, and academic awards. The Nipawin Royal Purple are also large contributors to the national charity, the Elks and Royal Purple Fund for Children.

During the evening, Mr. Speaker, Kay Fitton of Nipawin was presented with a 60-year pin. Mrs. Fitton has been a member since the formation of the Nipawin chapter. The Nipawin and area community benefit greatly from the hard work and dedication of people such as Mrs. Fitton.

This year the Nipawin Royal Purple welcomed five new members who will no doubt continue to contribute greatly to the betterment of their community.

I would ask all members to join me in congratulating Mrs. Fitton and the Nipawin Order of the Royal Purple on their 60th anniversary.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Growth in Southeast Regina

Ms. Hamilton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the future is wide open in southeast Regina. I draw members' attention to this area of the city because it's almost every week a ribbon is being cut, a new foundation is being poured, and new jobs become available.

What is being built, Mr. Speaker? The answer is opportunities. Mr. Speaker, there is a flurry of activity and investment all through the city. Freshly completed roads pave the way to businesses new to our city and our province. What kind of businesses are these, Mr. Speaker? They are new food, service, and retail stores ready to provide for the expanding lifestyle and growing economy Regina has been experiencing. There's a brand new Co-op grocery store, Reitmans, Hallmark, Home Outfitters, Pier 1, and Michaels — just to name a few. This economic enthusiasm is not restricted and contained to just my area of Regina. It's the case throughout the city.

Mr. Speaker, these new businesses demonstrate that people have decided to put their roots down rather than to put down our great province. Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, consumers are showing what they think of the economy — not with their feet as the opposition would hope, but with their wallets. With steady growth being projected by all major banks, Regina and

Saskatchewan's economy remains buoyant and robust.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Naicam Citizen Receives 2002 Agribusiness Leadership Award

Ms. Draude: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Germain Dauk, a distinguished farmer from Naicam, was recently honoured as the 2002 recipient of the Saskatoon and District Chamber of Commerce Agribusiness Leadership Award sponsored by Bayer CropScience. This annual award recognizes an individual who has demonstrated leadership, vision, and action which has shaped the development and expansion of agri-value and agribusiness across Saskatchewan.

Germain grew up on a family farm in Annaheim, received his Bachelor of Science in chemistry, his B.Ed. (Bachelor of Education) from the University of Saskatchewan. He played football with the U of S (University of Saskatchewan) Huskies and the Saskatchewan Roughriders.

For the next 20 years he took on the challenge of teaching Naicam's youth. After 20 years of teaching, Germain began farming with his father-in-law and is currently farming with his two sons, Richard and Ryan.

His interest in agriculture and innovative ideas led him to join many farm organizations, where his natural leadership abilities quickly placed him in executive positions. Anyone who personally knows Germain is aware of his commitment to his community and even though his farm and his involvement in farm-related organizations at the local, provincial, and national levels keep him extremely busy, he still finds time to support his community. Most of us who know him, know that his involvement in recreation, sport, and service clubs in the community have benefited everyone.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to ask this Assembly to join with me in congratulating Germain for winning the Agribusiness Leadership Award and thank him for his involvement in the community, province, and nation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Welfare Caseloads Decline

Mr. Prebble: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as the member for Saskatoon Idylwyld noted, employment in Saskatchewan is up 5.5 per cent this year. I'm pleased that many of these new workers are people who were formerly social assistance clients. It's very good news for Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, that welfare caseloads for the month of November were at their lowest level in the last eight years. Eight consecutive years of decline, Mr. Speaker.

In just one year welfare caseloads dropped by nearly 2,000, or 6.4 per cent. That could be an accident, Mr. Speaker, but the evidence suggests a successful government plan. At the heart of our plan is our building independence initiative which has helped 6,000 families leave welfare by removing barriers to work.

The supplementary income benefits paid under building independence have helped 13,500 children in Saskatchewan. Our partnership for prosperity economic development strategy created a record number of jobs for November and our income tax reform has removed 55,000 people from provincial tax rolls.

A three-part plan, Mr. Speaker, that create jobs, that ensures that all can share in the opportunities that exist in our province, and that reduces the tax burden on working families. This is a plan, Mr. Speaker. Not a slogan, but a plan with real results.

Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Liza Percy Named Saskatchewan Junior Citizen of the Year

Mr. Brkich: — Mr. Speaker, I rise in the house today to talk about a remarkable young lady, Liza Percy from Davidson, who on September 21 won the Saskatchewan Junior Citizen of the Year award.

Liza, daughter of Jim and Ruth Percy of Davidson, graduated last June from Davidson High School with full honours. She was nominated in early September after receiving several endorsements from her high school principal, Tony Baldwin, several teachers, and the mayor, Jim Cross.

The award is sponsored by the Saskatchewan Weekly Newspapers Association and includes a 3,000 student bursary award sponsored by SaskPower.

Liza is a very deserving recipient of this year's award, having excelled at helping others both at home and in her school and the surrounding community. Liza has a great attitude towards life and volunteerism, constant energy, and providing a prominent role model for fellow students and a high ability to communicate with people of all ages.

Some of the other activities Liza has taken part in include volleyball, basketball, curling, badminton, drama, SRC (student representative council), track and field. She has had extra community involvement as a 2002 Lifestyles Fair school representative, a Meals on Wheels delivery volunteer founder, also founder of the local Students Against Drunk Driving chapter, a volleyball and basketball official, and hosting an exchange student.

Liza is currently attending the University of Lethbridge for a degree in Health Sciences. I would ask all members to join me in congratulating Liza Percy on her high level of achievement. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

National Builder Awards to Citizens of Ukrainian Heritage

Hon. Mr. Hagel: — Very good, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, speakers, current and former, are by their nature a modest bunch, not given to tooting their own horns. And fortunately though, that natural three-cornered reticence need not apply

when one applauds another, which I'm happy to do today.

I'm pleased to advise my colleagues in the legislature, Mr. Speaker, that recently you and 10 other outstanding Saskatchewan citizens of Ukrainian heritage were given National Builder Awards by the Saskatchewan Provincial Council of the Ukrainian Canadian Congress.

The awards have been given now for eight years to those playing a significant role in keeping Ukrainian culture and language strong in our multicultural society. One of the other recipients, Marie Kishchuk of Wilkie, said that championing one's own culture gives one a sense of identity and community and a sense of place. She pointed out that six of the eleven, including yourself, Mr. Speaker, were teachers who were very prominent in the promotion of ongoing education and cultural awareness.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to name the other award recipients who were: Dr. Michael Krochak, musician Basil Baleshta, cultural promoter Michael Baran, teacher Stan Chepyha, teacher Mary Cherneskey, violinist Taras Gabora, teacher Katherine Labiuk, teacher Jayne Paluck, and the publisher John Zenchyshyn

Mr. Speaker, I ask all hon. members to join in recognizing these distinguished recipients.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Saskatchewan Indian Gaming Authority

Ms. Bakken: — Mr. Speaker, in November 2000 the Provincial Auditor released the results of an investigation into the financial scandal at Saskatchewan Indian Gaming Authority. The investigation concluded that senior officials and board members of SIGA (Saskatchewan Indian Gaming Authority) had misspent over \$2 million, including \$811,000 in improper spending by former CEO (chief executive officer), Dutch Lerat. The RCMP (Royal Canadian Mounted Police) also began an investigation in that same year. That investigation was concluded in January of last year and turned over to the Department of Justice. That was over 10 months ago.

Will the Justice minister advise the House as to what actions have been taken in regard to the RCMP investigations, and will the minister commit to make public any decision by the department, whether that decision is to lay charges or not lay charges?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Axworthy: — The member will know that it's not very easy to talk about things that are under investigation, and I'm sure she doesn't want me to talk about those things, Mr. Speaker. When I say not very easy, Mr. Speaker, I mean it would break my constitutional responsibility.

But I would say to the member that these matters, as she knows, have been presented to the prosecutions department who will consider these in accordance with their own standards and

requirements and will report to me in due course, Mr. Speaker.

But I don't have anything else to add at this stage and I'm sure the member would not want to prejudice any of the inquiries into these matters.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Bakken: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my next question is for the minister responsible for Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority. SLGA is responsible for regulating all gaming in Saskatchewan, and SLGA also launched an investigation into misspending of taxpayers' dollars by SIGA officials. The SLGA investigation concluded that \$2.3 million had been improperly spent by SIGA officials, including CEO Dutch Lerat.

In the SLGA's 2001 annual report, the government committed to collect \$1.36 million of the misspent money by withholding government payments to the First Nations Fund. And the government also committed last year to collect \$811,000 of taxpayers' money that was misspent by CEO Dutch Lerat.

Will the minister update the legislature on how much money has been withheld from the First Nations Fund and how much money has been recovered from Dutch Lerat?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(14:15)

Hon. Mr. Osika: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad to answer these questions and inform the House, and once again to underline the fact that the agreement that this coalition government has with First Nations is a good agreement for First Nations people and the people of this province.

As a matter of fact, I want to underline other comments made by people that do investigations and look into the whole scene about gambling and First Nations operations in this country, and they say Saskatchewan is on the leading edge and other provinces should follow our example of how good an arrangement we have looking after our First Nations people and our partners.

Money has been recovered from SIGA for . . . that was inappropriately expended, and the monies that have been inappropriately expended have been reported and will be subject of auditors' reports and financial statements that are presented.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Bakken: — Well, Mr. Speaker, we seem to have not received a concise answer from the minister.

I would like to ask another question of the minister. Mr. Speaker, both the Provincial Auditor and Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority have concluded that there was a serious misuse and abuse of millions of taxpayers' dollars at SIGA between 1997 and 2001. The RCMP has concluded a criminal investigation into this misuse of taxpayers' dollars.

Will the minister confirm to the people of Saskatchewan and to this Assembly that the government has taken steps to ensure that SIGA has stopped improperly spending taxpayers' money and that SIGA is operating within the rules established after the financial scandal that was revealed in the year 2000?

Hon. Mr. Osika: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And one single response with one word — absolutely.

The SLGA and SIGA have been following the auditors' directions and the benchmarks that have been set, and we continue to work in a co-operative fashion to benefit First Nations people and all the people of this great province of ours and afford people the opportunities for a good future that we have in this province — a wide open future, I might add — that is available for anybody and everybody that wants to contribute to the economy of this great province of ours.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Government Participation in Potato Industry

Mr. Wall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in 1997 the NDP (New Democratic Party) took millions of taxpayers' dollars and they risked them in the potato business. They told Saskatchewan taxpayers that they were going to be doing it under the auspices of a partnership. But that wasn't the case.

By 1998 they knew their investment was in huge trouble and they ordered an internal audit, Mr. Speaker. What did this internal audit say about the NDP potato deal?

Question to the minister is this. What were the reasons that the NDP decided to mislead the people of Saskatchewan about this deal?

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order. Order. Order. Order. I would ask the member to rephrase his question in a way that it would not indicate any wrong intentions on the part of any hon. member.

Mr. Wall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What were the reasons behind the NDP portraying this deal to Saskatchewan people in a way that wasn't correct?

Hon. Mr. Sonntag: — Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Well of course, the member knows that the rule pertaining to discussing issues before the courts is one that we respect on this . . . at least on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker. We respect it at least on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the rule exists to protect both parties, not just the government but the plaintiffs as well, Mr. Speaker. And the member should acknowledge and respect, I ask as well, Mr. Speaker, that it applies . . . the rule applies not just to the government but it applies to members opposite as well. They should consider that carefully before they engage too much discussion, Mr. Speaker, about what's going on to the courts, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wall: — Mr. Speaker, throughout this process the official

opposition has asked general questions about how it was taxpayers wound up losing \$28 million because of NDP decisions. We will continue to ask those questions until we get some answers, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wall: — Mr. Speaker, on Monday we asked the NDP to start telling the truth and release the internal audit. That, they refused. They refused so far to release that internal audit.

This morning . . . Mr. Speaker, this morning, a copy of that Ernst & Young audit arrived at my office in a brown envelope. And I note, as far as we could tell, Mr. Speaker, this document is not part of the court filings that have been referred to so far. So the minister should be able to answer the question.

Mr. Speaker, in this audit the officials at Ernst & Young confirm that there never was a partnership with a private company. It was always 100 per cent owned by the government. Mr. Speaker, why did the NDP tell the people of Saskatchewan that this deal was a partnership when that clearly wasn't the truth?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Sonntag: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the member asks why I don't answer the question. And yet on a daily basis, and in that very question, he references a document, Mr. Speaker, that's a part of the examination for discovery, Mr. Speaker. He references documents, Mr. Speaker. On a daily basis, he references documents that are part of the examination for discovery, Mr. Speaker, and then he asks me to respond.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all members on both sides of the Assembly to respect the due process that the courts are engaged in on this very day, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wall: — Mr. Speaker, Ernst & Young makes it very clear this deal was never a partnership. The audit says, and I quote:

The Storco's are owned (those are the storage companies are owned) 51% by CFI and 49% by SPUDCO. However the total amount of investment by CFI in each Storco is only \$51 (\$51, Mr. Speaker) and there is no (this is the report now, Mr. Speaker; there is no) economic evidence to suggest that CFI is a partner . . .

Mr. Speaker, the Ernst & Young report confirmed on June 25, 1998 that this deal wasn't really a partnership. So did that cause the NDP to then tell the truth about the deal? The answer is no, Mr. Speaker. No, they did not come out and tell people the facts as had been presented to them in the Ernst & Young report.

So, Mr. Speaker, this question is for the Premier: why did the NDP continue to cover up the true risk to taxpayers, even after it received the Ernst & Young report?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Sonntag: — Well again, Mr. Speaker, the member

continues to reference documents that are part of examinations for discovery. And just because he says it's not part of a document that is in the process of examination for discovery, Mr. Speaker, he says many things in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that we find out later may not be altogether true, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that member to respect the process of the courts, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wall: — He is still hiding behind the courts. These are general questions about decisions they made on behalf of taxpayers that risked and lost \$28 million, Mr. Speaker.

So they won't answer the questions. But fortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Ernst & Young audit answers a lot of the questions. Ernst & Young says, and I quote, Mr. Speaker. Here's the quote, Mr. Speaker:

. . . (Sask Water Corporation) Management has indicated that the current ownership structure (this answers the question, why would they do this; why would they cover it up; that the current ownership structure) provides a number of potential benefits, including avoidance of international trade investigations, use of non-unionized labor for construction, and (Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker) the optics (the optics) of significant private sector investment.

That's what that report says, Mr. Speaker.

In other words, they set up this phony-baloney deal to fool our trading partners, Mr. Speaker, to get around their own construction tendering policy, and to deceive the people of Saskatchewan.

Will the Premier please stand in his place today, Mr. Speaker, and tell this House if he thinks that's acceptable on the part of his government?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Sonntag: — Mr. Speaker, if that member's of the notion that I'm not desirous of asking the questions that he's asked, he's sadly mistaken, Mr. Speaker. But I am going to quote directly from the . . . what is referred to as the *sub judice* convention. It says that in section 505, Mr. Speaker, it says:

Members are expected to refrain from discussing matters that are before the courts or tribunals which are courts of record (Mr. Speaker). The purpose of this *sub judice* convention is to protect the parties in a case awaiting or undergoing trial and persons who stand to be affected by the outcome of a judicial inquiry. It is a voluntary restraint imposed by the House upon itself in the interest of justice and fair play (Mr. Speaker).

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wall: — Mr. Speaker, that minister just stood in his place and said there should be no doubt that he is willing to ask these questions. Where was he in 1998 when CIC (Crown

Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan) officials exposed this ruse for what it was? Where were his questions then when he could have saved taxpayers \$14 million, Mr. Speaker? It wasn't before the courts then, Mr. Speaker.

Let's try this again. In 1997, the current Minister of Industry proposes to the cabinet a partnership to build potato storages, only there was no partnership. We know that now. The government put up millions; the private company had no risk. And what was the reason?

What would be the reason for that, for that deception, and then subsequent to that what would be the reason to put more money into the project even when they know the truth? To get around international trade laws, Mr. Speaker. To avoid their own construction tendering policy, Mr. Speaker. And to give the optics to the taxpayers if there was a partner.

I'll ask the Premier again: does he believe that is acceptable and appropriate behaviour for his NDP government?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Sonntag: — Where was I, Mr. Speaker? Where was he, Mr. Speaker, in the 1980s, Mr. Speaker, when they put in a pile of money in infrastructure, Mr. Speaker? Where was he?

I'll tell you where he was, Mr. Speaker. He was working for a minister, Mr. Speaker. He was running around privatizing Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. That's where he was, Mr. Speaker.

They put in excess of hundreds of . . . with the federal government some \$140 million, Mr. Speaker, in infrastructure in irrigation . . .

The Speaker: — Order, please. Order. Order. Order.

Hon. Mr. Sonntag: — Mr. Speaker, some \$140 million-plus in irrigation infrastructure that was lying in the ground not being able to add value to any crops, Mr. Speaker, or very few.

Mr. Speaker, what did we do? We worked with the growers to add value. And, Mr. Speaker, I provide an update for the Assembly, Mr. Speaker. I said yesterday there were 10,000 acres, Mr. Speaker. There are in excess of 13,000 acres, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wall: — Mr. Speaker, on June 25, 1998 or shortly thereafter, that minister that just stood on his feet would have had access to this Ernest & Young report that clearly outlined this as the ruse that it is, that we know it is today; that clearly highlighted that the government tried to get around its own tendering policy when it set this up; that they were trying to deceive our largest trading partner, Mr. Speaker; and more importantly, that they were . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Order. Once again . . . Order. Once again, I would ask the member to be very careful about the way he phrases his statements implying . . . Order.

I would ask the member to be very careful in any statements he

makes in the legislature that should not imply motives of wrongdoing on the part of any member. Any member is capable of making a mistake, but no hon. member in this House should be accused of attempting deliberately to falsify or deceive.

So I would ask all members, in their remarks, to be very careful when they're making that type of statement.

Mr. Wall: — Mr. Speaker, the point is, he sat at that table; he knew all of the information. He did nothing, Mr. Speaker. That's the point. And that's what he and the rest of his colleagues ought to remember as they ask the questions that . . . and answer the questions that we're asking.

Mr. Speaker, this whole thing started because the current Minister of Industry came to cabinet in 1997 with, at best, incomplete information, and for the most part, incorrect information, Mr. Speaker.

So what has happened to that individual? Has he been relieved of his duties? No, Mr. Speaker, he still sits at the cabinet table. He still negotiates multi-million dollar deals with the private sector. Mr. Speaker, the executives who covered up the Enron scandal aren't negotiating deals any more; they're going to jail.

(14:30)

Why is this minister still negotiating deals on behalf of Saskatchewan taxpayers? And will the Premier do the right thing today, Mr. Speaker? Will he do the right thing today and ask for the resignation of his Minister of Industry?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, I will do no such thing.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, what else neither this Premier nor any member of this government will do under my watch, is what I heard from this opposition today.

In its first set of questioning, what were they telling us to do? Interfere with the prosecutions branch of the Department of Justice. That's what they were telling us to do. Now they'll deny it, but that's what they were telling us to do.

What have we heard this week? No respect — no respect — for the due process of law, which is happening in a courtroom today. No respect.

Mr. Speaker, I will not ask today for the resignation — or any day for the resignation — of this minister. And I will have no member of this government trying to influence the prosecutions branch or interfering in the due process of law.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wall: — Mr. Speaker, any fair-minded individual who has followed the proceedings over the last number of days will know that we have asked general questions on a public policy matter that end up costing taxpayers \$28 million. They have been general, general questions and that Premier and that

government has hid behind the courts.

That Premier just stood up and said for all of these . . .

The Speaker: — Order, please. Order. Allow the question to be put.

Mr. Wall: — That Premier has just stood up and said for all of these transgressions, for this, Mr. Speaker, for deceiving Saskatchewan people, this minister — this minister — will not be fired. That's what he . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Order.

Mr. Wall: — For all of the transgressions that Ernst & Young laid out, this minister who started the whole debacle will not be fired.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Premier that the Saskatchewan people will not hesitate what he lacks the courage to do. They will fire that minister and they'll fire the rest of them . . . (inaudible) . . . Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wall: — Mr. Speaker, very quickly, the Ernst & Young audit has much to say, including that there was insufficient explanation of the level at risk and commitment made by Sask Water to the cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, who is responsible for that? Who is responsible for the lack of information coming to the cabinet of the province of Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Sonntag: — Mr. Speaker, the member can ask the question in as many different ways as he wants, Mr. Speaker. We've answered here many times what the situation is.

The issue is right now in the process of examination for discovery, Mr. Speaker. It's impossible for us to answer the question. I said as many times as I would like to defend the government's position, it is absolutely inappropriate for me to do so. It not only jeopardizes the government's position, Mr. Speaker, it also jeopardizes the plaintiff's position, Mr. Speaker.

He references documents I believe, Mr. Speaker, on a daily basis that are part of the examination for discovery, documents that the plaintiff has requested as part of the court process, Mr. Speaker. Absolutely inappropriate for any of us to be commenting or to be responding to, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wall: — We've asked the government why. Why did they do this, starting back in 1997? Why did that original cabinet item not provide the correct information? And when they had the correct information a year later, why did they decide to put more millions into this thing instead of stopping it?

And the answer is in this report, this Ernst & Young report. Once again, Mr. Speaker, Sask Water Corporation management has indicated that the current ownership structure provides a

number of potential benefits including avoidance of international trade investigations; the use of non-unionized labour for construction, which would violate their own tendering policy; and the optics, the optics of significant private sector investment.

Mr. Speaker, those are facts. Those are the facts today. So we're asking the Premier to do the right thing. The Premier should hold accountable his member of the cabinet that began this whole affair, who now sits as the Minister of Industry and is still negotiating deals, deals that he characterizes in the same way as he did this one. Will he do that today? Will he ask for the resignation of the Minister of Industry?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — I want to . . . I want to point members opposite to what we heard during members' statements today. During the tenure of this Minister of Industry and Resources and during the tenure of this Premier, we've seen a major, major turnaround in the economy of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — I want to quote again, Mr. Speaker. I want to quote again the report from *The Globe and Mail* of December 9, 2002. This columnist reports, this business columnist reports:

There are many ways to look at the job market (in Canada) . . . we'll examine a few.

(Let's) begin with the provinces. Five provinces have exceeded the national gain of 3.3 per cent since December . . .

Now listen to this, Mr. Speaker, and the member from Rosthern should be quiet in his bench and listen:

Despite their economic woes this year with farming and forestry respectively, Saskatchewan leads the way with a 5.5 per cent job gain . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — This province is leading Canada, leading Canada in spite of the doom and the gloom that proceeds from that party, in spite of a party that only comes to the people of Saskatchewan with a slogan. This government, this minister comes with a plan, puts the plan in place, and the plan is working.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wall: — Mr. Speaker, the Premier had a chance to show some leadership here today on this very serious matter and he didn't do it, Mr. Speaker. There was no leadership in that answer he just gave.

He is right about one thing. It isn't only the current Minister of Industry that should be held to account, Mr. Speaker. Every single cabinet minister that sits over there, that sat around that table in 1998 and made the decision to ignore the truth and risk

millions more in this and lose it eventually, to destroy an industry eventually, Mr. Speaker, and to lose \$28 million — they should all be fired, Mr. Speaker. Every last one of them. And that'll be happening in the next election.

Mr. Speaker, he won't do anything about the current Minister of Industry. In fact what he allows the minister to do, he gives him a \$100 million credit card and tells him to negotiate yet another deal. And what have we heard about the Broe deal so far? That there's a significant private sector partner, that they're taking the majority of the risk. The information's all the same.

Can the Premier stand in his place today and tell us why, in light of the events of this week and the revelations, why we should trust this government on any future deal they make, Mr. Speaker?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Sonntag: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, I ask them just to look at the statistics, Mr. Speaker. Look at the job growth; the numbers in November of this year alone, Mr. Speaker. It's incredible, Mr. Speaker. You don't listen to me, Mr. Speaker; just look at the facts, Mr. Speaker.

I say, why did we invest in the potato industry? It's simple. I've said it before and I'll say it again, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we worked with the growers to assist them in diversifying an area of agriculture, Mr. Speaker, that had tremendous potential.

And if you look at the latest StatsCan numbers, Mr. Speaker, we have over 13,000 acres, Mr. Speaker, and they say . . . they also say in those numbers that they're looking at a 12 per cent growth for next year, Mr. Speaker. That's why we work with the growers out there, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Saskatchewan Committee for the Queen's Golden Jubilee

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I would want to welcome again in the gallery, your gallery, the members of the Queen's Golden Jubilee Committee and a number of other representatives of royal organizations in our province who have worked with the committee all this year. I would say, Mr. Speaker, thanks to their combined efforts, the Golden Jubilee celebrations in our province have been a great success.

And I would invite all members — all members — to show our warm appreciation to the members of the Queen's Golden Jubilee Committee and the other royal representatives who are here today for the work that they have done throughout the course of this year.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, as the Golden Jubilee year draws to a close, it is now timely, I think, that we look to the future. And of course, the province's centennial year is foremost in our minds. And, Mr. Speaker, it is our hope and our

expectation that Her Majesty, the Queen, will be able to visit Saskatchewan in 2005 for this landmark anniversary.

However, Mr. Speaker, next year, 2003, also marks some very significant milestones in Saskatchewan communities. In the year 2003, in the cities of Regina, Moose Jaw, and Lloydminster will all celebrate their centennials. And in the year 2003, the new Saskatchewan Indian Federated College at the University of Regina and the cultural centre in Prince Albert will open. And all of us in Saskatchewan will celebrate these tremendous occasions in the life of our province.

It is therefore, Mr. Speaker, with great pleasure that today I announce that their Royal Highnesses, The Earl and Countess of Wessex have accepted Saskatchewan's invitation to visit our province from June 18 to June 23, 2003.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Prince Edward and his wife Sophie have kindly agreed to celebrate the city centennials with us; to officially open the Saskatchewan Indian Federated College building and the Prince Albert cultural centre. As many of us will know, Mr. Speaker, Prince Edward is also a patron of the Globe Theatre in Regina and international president of The Duke of Edinburgh's awards. And both of those organizations will also be involved in the royal visit.

Mr. Speaker, the province will coordinate the visit in partnership with the host municipalities and organizations.

And so today, Mr. Speaker, I would very much like to acknowledge the presence, again the presence in your gallery this afternoon, of four of our mayors and a leading educator in our province. And perhaps as I indicate their name, they may just want to stand and just give us a little wave — His Worship Pat Fiacco, mayor of Regina; His Worship Al Schwinghamer, mayor of Moose Jaw; His Worship Ken Baker, mayor of Lloydminster; His Worship Mayor Don Cody of Prince Albert; and President of the Saskatchewan Indian Federated College, Dr. Eber Hampton.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, I know that all members of this House will join with me in expressing our appreciation to The Earl and Countess of Wessex for accepting our invitation to share this important year with us in the life of our province next year. And I'm equally confident that all the people of our province will extend to the royal couple a very, very warm Saskatchewan welcome next June. Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hermanson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And on behalf of the official opposition in Saskatchewan, I too would like to welcome our distinguished guests in the gallery, the representatives of the Queen's Golden Jubilee Committee who are present. Also I see Dr. Michael Jackson in the gallery who coordinated a lot of the celebration around the awarding of the Queen's Golden Jubilee medals.

We certainly appreciate the efforts that you have put forward to

make this celebration one in which Saskatchewan participated; I understand from Dr. Jackson, showed some leadership nationally and of course was well received in the province.

(14:45)

I would join with the Premier in welcoming the visit of the Earl and Countess of Wessex to Saskatchewan next year. That is, of course, a very exciting event and it's to commemorate a number of celebrations here in the province of Saskatchewan. As the Premier has mentioned, three of our cities are celebrating their centennials. And I too would welcome Mayor Fiacco from Regina, Mayor Schwinghamer from Moose Jaw, and Mayor Baker from Lloydminster. It's good to have them in the gallery.

Also seeing Mayor Cody from Prince Albert who's involved in the celebration in a slightly different way with the opening of the cultural centre, and Dr. Hampton from the Indian Federated College. We welcome you here as well and we're glad that you're present in the gallery to take part in this very happy announcement.

A few years ago when I was the Member of Parliament for Kindersley-Lloydminster, we did have the privilege in Saskatchewan of hosting the Prince, Prince Edward, when he in fact was made the patron of the Globe Theatre. It was a pleasure to meet him at that time. We now look forward to not only meeting the Prince but to also meet the Countess.

And I'm sure that it's a great celebration that we'll all enjoy in Saskatchewan in the lead up to a number of other great celebrations — the centennial of the province of Saskatchewan and an election, hopefully some time next year.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

POINT OF ORDER

Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before orders of the day I rise on a point of order.

Last evening during the debate on the motion regarding the Kyoto Protocol, on page 2,897, remarks given by the Leader of the Opposition, the member from Rosetown-Biggar, the member from Rosetown-Biggar referred to the member from Saskatoon Greystone as including a fanatical presentation.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to rule on this because I understand that all remarks given in the legislature are remarks given in good faith, that we need to be respectful of each others' remarks, and that we are not to impugn the members who are speaking in the legislature. And it's my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that these remarks were unparliamentary, and that these remarks should be withdrawn and the member should be asked to apologize.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I haven't had a chance to review the exact wording, but if the word is indeed, fanatical, that would mean, Mr. Speaker, someone who is very enthusiastic about the . . . passionate about what they were describing, Mr. Speaker. And in no way

was it used in a derogatory term, Mr. Speaker, so I would ask that you rule that there is no valid point of order.

The Speaker: — I thank the member for Saskatoon Nutana for raising the point of order and for the response from the Opposition House Leader.

Members of the Assembly, when it comes to language in the legislature, there is a list that is published that . . . even that list is occasionally breached. A lot of it depends on the content, on the context of the debate. Quite often it depends on just whether or not the members themselves are offended or not.

So I would . . . As I recall a debate at that time, there were a couple of members who objected to the wording, but probably not any more than they object to many other things that have been said in this House. So I would just ask members to be respectful of each other, try not to exceed the tolerable limits within this House.

And so with that, I would just leave it under that advice and respond to the member that her point is well regarded but cannot be . . . I'm not asking for any other action on that basis except for members to be mindful of what they say.

Thank you.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTION UNDER RULE 46

Kyoto Protocol

Mr. Goulet: —Mr. Speaker, of course I rise to support the motion by the government and to go against the amendment by the Sask Party.

Mr. Speaker, the way that I look at the debate, on one side we have the government members who are dealing with the issue on a balanced, sustainable, and practical level. We are talking here about a balance between economic development and the environment. All of our members who have made speeches talked about that very, very important balance.

When we look at the Saskatchewan Party amendment and many of their commentary, while they do from time to time make a small, little comment on the environment, basically their position is on the economic front only. While it is very important to look at the dollar side of the equation, you have to be able to combine it with the environmental side.

And I know that there are many, many things that have been said in the debate that were problematic. As I watched and listened to the debate, I listened to the Leader of the Opposition and I'll go back to that quotation and reflect upon, you know, the other member's comment because I think it's very, very important to be able to put that on the record, you know, for the members. Because our argument is to combine both the economic and the environmental agenda and to deal with a few

of the questions in that front with 12 important principles that were indeed supported by all provinces and the territories.

I will therefore take a quote from the side of the Leader of the Opposition. I've noted over the past while in context, Mr. Speaker, that the Sask Party is trying to sell themselves as a moderate party. They try and sell themselves as, you know, somebody who can possibly govern. And we see some of the statements they make in Saskatoon. They never actually make the same statements here and there but they do very, very selective statements. They try and present themselves as a moderate party. We see them in different debates, but sometimes, of course, the real world comes out. Although they try and hide behind sheep's clothing, the wolf comes out.

And it is in this case a very, very important one because when I hear the Leader of the Opposition having to use the language that he did — you know, more extreme type language — that proved the point. And I would put it on the record as to what he actually said. It's . . . quote:

It's very clear (he said) — Kyoto cannot work. But yet members on the other side, including the fanatical presentation by the member who preceded me, are heard from that side of the House.

He also said:

. . . the member . . . (from) Saskatoon Greystone had an opinion and spoke out loud — as misguided and ridiculous as it was.

But what was the statement that the member from Saskatoon Greystone concluded with? The member from Saskatoon Greystone said this in conclusion:

We are standing, Mr. Speaker . . . and I know, Mr. Speaker, that we . . . (all) stand firm in terms of negotiating a fair position that protects the interests of the Saskatchewan economy and all Saskatchewan residents.

But I'll give you the actual quote right from the beginning. And this is what the member from Greystone actually said:

We are standing, Mr. Speaker, in support of the principles and objectives of the Protocol, and I know, Mr. Speaker, that we . . . also stand firm in terms of negotiating a fair position that protects the interests of the Saskatchewan economy and all Saskatchewan residents.

Mr. Speaker, I don't see anything fanatical about that statement. I don't see anything ridiculous about that statement. I thought that the member, the Leader of the Opposition, stooped really low to come out and actually make that comment. It was not becoming, you know, the parliamentary debate that we have over here. I thought that he should have outlined his points, you know, from time to time, even in regards to the statements from their other members.

The only quotes that I could see from their statements were from the Canadian Taxpayers Federation and also from a few of the selected scientists. But everybody knows the history in regards to the issue relating to the environment.

Back in the early '80s we had the Brundtland Commission. And the scientists of the world came together and presented a plan in regards to the environment and coined a term that had been used prior to that time on sustainable development. And they produced a document. Gro Brundtland, who was the prime minister of Norway at that time, presented that document. And it was . . . a book came out published by Oxford called *Our Common Future*.

Later on as we dealt with the environmental issue, they also went on to do the 1988 development. There was an international panel on climate change, and many other people started recognizing the need for environmental regulations, protections, and controls if we were to deal with the overall issue of sustainable development.

We also saw the debates in Rio and then we went to Kyoto. In every single one of those cases since the early '80s, people have recognized the need to do something vis-à-vis the environment. And when we were looking at that, Mr. Speaker, many of the statements made by the members opposite were basically platitudinous. It was very soft statements, never really convincing in regards to the importance of the question of the environment.

When I was growing up in Cumberland in northern Saskatchewan, we used to see the smokestack in Flin Flon, and we saw the sulphur dioxide emissions that were there. As I was growing up, later on we knew and the elders talked about the problem of that.

We had a concept in the Cree language which we called *kuochinan*, and I'll leave that on the record and I'll send it to *Hansard* later on, on that particular word because it's a very appropriate word.

The word *kuochinan* in Cree really means that if you do something to destroy the environment, to wreck the environment, or to create harm to animals, whatever it is that befalls them in terms of sickness, the belief was that it would come back to haunt you, and that indeed you would get the sickness and the illness yourself.

And when we were doing hunting when I was growing up, we had to make sure that you did it in the most humane manner and also to make sure that when I was hunting grouse or ducks that we did a quick kill, because if an animal ever escaped and you didn't do the proper hunting, people would say *kuochinan*.

So that particular concept, you know, is used in a modern ecosystems debates on the environment. And I think there are many, many other scientists throughout the world, you know, agree to that.

The members now opposite of course quote scientists who disagree with that. And obviously they seem to assume . . . seem to say that that's a new position. It really isn't. Thirty years ago the majority of the scientists were on the other side — 40 years ago — and that very few people thought that there was a problem with global warming, greenhouse gases, etc. It's been a major shift over the past 30 years. And we see the shift now; where there was a smaller number of scientists who were talking about that, the majority of the scientists are now talking

about that.

(15:00)

People from the Sask Party and their debates are going back, you know, 40 years ago in that regard. And there is no question about that, that there is a few scientists that are indeed the position of the Sask Party.

But the majority of the scientists have shifted their position and agree with the fact that you have to do something about global warming.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, so the point of the matter is that the Sask Party in this case is the one that's taking the extreme position. They are taking the backward position. And they're the ones . . . I wouldn't go as far as to say they are fanatical. I would say indeed that a greater care must be taken on their part in regards to dealing with this issue in a more up-to-date fashion.

I looked at the issue as well from the economic development side. Mr. Speaker, they have quoted about the few countries that are indeed not agreeing with Kyoto. But let's remember that there are 38 countries, developing countries, that agree with Kyoto — 38 countries. And when you look at that development, there is a lot of new aspects of that development that take place even in countries who disagree . . . You know, from the United States . . . they're already planning and preparing to deal with this issue.

And a lot of the top businesses that are dealing with this issue — while some will complain about it — recognize that they have to do something into the future. They know that.

We have seen the evolution and the development of solar power, wind power, and other alternate cogeneration developments; you know, shifting from coal-fired to a natural gas, for example. So we've seen that planning and the development taking place over time vis-à-vis Saskatchewan. We are taking a leadership role on that with Saskatchewan . . . I mean, the Power Corporation.

In forestry, we have put aside, in 1999, 6 million over a five-year period. And in that plan, we are trying to put aside 500,000 acres . . . hectares, I mean, of land on the forestry side. And we're also looking at putting in 5 million seedlings, of which 3 have already been planted.

And when I look at that development, I'd like to do a bit of a quote on it from November 16 on the *Leader-Post*, 2002. This is what one of the . . . our own persons from the department says — his name is Al Willcocks and this is his explanation:

Trees are carbon eaters . . . They absorb carbon dioxide — which contributes to global warming — retain the carbon, and emit oxygen.

He goes on to say:

One acre of mature trees produces enough oxygen for five

people to live on for a year . . .

One acre of mature trees produces enough oxygen for five people to live on for a year. So although the Saskatchewan Party doesn't really care about those types of developments, these are very, very positive in regards to leadership, you know, throughout the world.

And we also have done a lot of the stuff in regards to the wind power. As of now we've gone into to do 17 megawatts of power on wind generation. We have 11.2 megawatts vis-à-vis SunBridge, you know, a combination of the Enbridge company and Suncor, and . . . near Gull Lake, and they are moving to do development on that. We also have 5.9 megawatts on Cypress, and we are now talking also about going to 150 megawatts in the future.

So we're looking at making sure we have a balanced approach, Mr. Speaker, and that indeed we take into consideration both the economic development side and also on the environmental side. When I look at the Sask Party they're going back to more of their extreme ways, their one-sided ways, and only looking at the economic development side, and completely disregarding the solid research in regards to the environmental side.

Some of them will express a few platitudes on the environment but the result is that the majority of them have been more strongly opposed to Kyoto than in regards to the possibilities of joining forces with all the provinces plus the territories. Even Ralph Klein and the province of Alberta, you know, are part of the people in regards to the 12 points. So with that I will close by looking at this reasonable approach. No. 2:

The plan must ensure that no region or jurisdiction shall be asked to bear an unreasonable share of the burden and no industry, sector, or region shall be treated unfairly. The costs and impacts on individuals, businesses, and industries must be clear, reasonable, achievable, and economically sustainable.

It also says on point no. 11:

The plan must include incentives for all citizens, communities, businesses, and jurisdictions to make the shift to an economy based on renewable and other clean energy, lower emissions, and sustainable practices across sectors.

Point 12:

The implementation of any climate change . . . must include an incentive and allocation system that supports lower carbon emission sources of energy such as hydroelectricity, wind power generation, ethanol, and renewable and other clean sources of energy.

Mr. Speaker, that to me is the reasonable, practical, and achievable way of dealing with this issue. The Sask Party is still back in the Dark Ages. They may try and use statements like fanatical, they may try and use statements like ridiculous, but it is really unbecoming of the debate and I really feel that it shows that they're on very shaky ground when they are dealing with this issue.

And I really feel that as we move forward into the future, we have to remember what I learned when I was growing up. You have to respect the environment and if you don't, it'll come back to haunt you. And in many cases, that indeed the combination of jobs and environment is the way of the future. We are joining forces with all the other provinces and territories to make a strong stand so that indeed something is achievable into the future.

So with that I'd like to support our resolution and also to oppose the amendment by the Sask Party.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Weekes: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to speak on this very important issue, the Kyoto accord. And by many, it's a flawed agreement . . . agreement that is going to hurt Canada and hurt Saskatchewan.

And I'd just like to take some time and talk about how the Kyoto Protocol was developed and where it came from. Mr. Speaker, the Kyoto Protocol's part of an international treaty called the Kyoto accord. The Kyoto Protocol mandates a set of country-specific standards for the emission of greenhouse gases.

Mr. Speaker, the Kyoto accord evolved from studies by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change or IPCC. The IPCC was formed in 1988 and IPCC reports in 1996 concluded climate change was occurring partly as a result of the man-made emissions of greenhouse gases.

However, the scientific community is split on the overall environment benefit of the emission reduction targets in the Kyoto Protocol. There's also significant debate within the scientific community about the validity of the conclusion that made greenhouse gas emissions, that man-made greenhouse gas emissions are causing climate change to global warming.

Nevertheless the 1996 IPCC report led many governments around the world, including Canada, to adopt greenhouse gas reductions as a national policy. The Kyoto Protocol was negotiated in 1997. Under Kyoto, Canada is required to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 94 per cent of the 1990 levels by the year 2012.

Now Canada, under Kyoto, has agreed to reduce greenhouse emissions to 6 per cent below 1990 levels by 2012. This would represent a 26 per cent reduction from projected 2012 levels. Two years ago Canada had surpassed its 1990 levels by close to 20 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, so far 86 countries have ratified the Kyoto Protocol, roughly half the number that attended the Kyoto conference, and the United States has not ratified Kyoto. I'd like to discuss that issue a little later.

Now some sticking points for Canada, and in particular Saskatchewan. Canada has argued it should receive greater credit for carbon sinks. This is the term used for forest and other vegetation that absorb carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, store it, and produce oxygen. Canada also asked for more clean energy export credits for the natural gas and electricity it sells to

the United States.

The Canadian oil and gas industry has also argued that the economic impact of sweeping emissions reductions would harm the Canadian economy while a flight from Canada's oil and gas would not necessarily mean a global reduction in the burning of these fossil fuels.

And in the future, Mr. Speaker, the Protocol will only become legally binding when it is ratified by at least 55 countries, covering at least 55 per cent of the emissions addressed by the Protocol. The 55-country benchmark has been passed but the 23 industrialized countries that have ratified it present only 36.6 per cent of 1990 emission levels. Canada represents only 2 per cent of these emissions.

So, Mr. Speaker, the question is, why is Kyoto important to Saskatchewan? Well, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan is the second largest producer of greenhouse gases per capita in Canada. Saskatchewan greenhouse gas emissions have grown by 31 per cent since 1990, compared to the national average of 14 per cent. The Kyoto Protocol would require Saskatchewan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 6 per cent below the 1990 levels by 2002.

Now there's been a lot said about the impact of Kyoto on Saskatchewan and on Canada. It is said by many scientists and experts in Saskatchewan and in Canada that Kyoto will kill thousands of jobs in Saskatchewan's most important industries — namely agriculture, mining, forestry, and gas.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at agriculture. The Saskatchewan and Canadian farmer is the most efficient farmers in the world, and we have done that by using technologies. And part of that impact has been going to use greater, larger equipment and of course equipment that uses gasoline and diesel fuel which give off emissions.

This Protocol would certainly increase the costs to our Saskatchewan farmers, increase costs to our agriculture. And hand in hand with that, as to date, Saskatchewan farmers are not able to use the carbon sinks that are being discussed but not part of the Kyoto Protocol as of this year. So, Mr. Speaker, agriculture is going to be hurt by this Protocol. We're not going to be able to use the benefits of carbon sinks in our negotiations in our agreements that Kyoto has outlined to date.

And of course when we look at Saskatchewan, we talk about developing Saskatchewan, rural revitalization, growing Saskatchewan. And of course at every turn we look, agriculture and mining and forestry, and oil and gas, these are considered negative in the eyes of the Kyoto agreement. And this is going to put a dampening effect on our growth in this province if the federal government does not, with the help of Saskatchewan and the other provinces, do not take these industries into account and protect these industries from the very negative effects of the Kyoto agreement.

Other problems around the Kyoto agreement that affect Saskatchewan/Canada is of course the United States, our largest trading partner. The United States has not ratified Kyoto and we don't know if they ever will. So we're set up in a situation where Canada and Saskatchewan has ratified Kyoto and so the

increased cost to our industries, to our agriculture, and to our country and our economy, and we have to compete with the United States which have not signed on to Kyoto. So this puts Saskatchewan and Canada at an economic disadvantage right off the top.

(15:15)

Groups like the Canadian Taxpayers Federation estimate ratification of the Protocol will cost every family in Canada approximately \$2,700 per year.

Other examples. IPSCO. IPSCO is now threatening to leave Saskatchewan if there aren't amendments to the Protocol which they say will force this company out of Saskatchewan back into the United States where they have other plants. And we will lose hundreds of jobs if this happens.

Our own SaskPower estimates Kyoto would cost the provincial power utility as much as \$250 million per year, and this would increase utility bills. You could see the bills going up by as much as 25 per cent. Even the province's own Department of Industry and Resources estimates Kyoto could cost as much as \$2.6 billion in economic output by the year 2020.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is a very serious situation. This is a very serious Protocol and accord that Canada has signed on to, and without any plan. We're really signing on to a Protocol without . . . that we have to negotiate into the future. He doesn't have a plan in place. Industries and the provinces don't know where to go from here on and we've really signed on to something that may hurt us dramatically in the future.

Other examples of where the Protocol will hurt Canada is the Canadian exporters and manufacturers association estimates a loss of 450,000 jobs in Canada. These are dramatic losses. There's a number of estimates of job losses and economic downturn caused by the . . . possibly caused by the Kyoto agreement.

One only has to look at other types of policies the federal government has placed in the past, and you look, only need to look at the national energy program. It was devastating to the West, to the energy producing provinces of Canada at the time.

And we have to . . . And the provincial government and the NDP government should take this possibility very seriously and to protect the economy of Saskatchewan and Western Canada from a Liberal federal government that really does not look out for the Western Canadian interests in any way. And we only need to look at the national energy program as an example of that.

Other problems with Kyoto is the concern of the rest of the world. Western Europe has signed on to this accord. Just because of their proximity and their history, they do not have to make the dramatic changes in order to meet the reductions.

We have seen the United States have not ratified the agreement. Developing countries like China and Italy and many other developing countries are not obligated under the accord, so they can pollute as much as they want and not be affected in any way.

One example is Russia. After the fall of the Soviet Union, the Russian economy has collapsed and so they now are in a position of being able to sell carbon credits to other countries. So we could see a situation where North American companies could buy credits from Russia, Russia could keep polluting as they try to build their economy back up, and the western companies could continue to pollute. All that we see is a huge transfer, a potentially huge transfer of capital from the western economies to Russia and countries like that without making any change in the environmental impact of greenhouse gases.

So there are many things that have to be sorted out to take into account those types of situations where we make dramatic, have a dramatic effect on our economy in North America and in Canada without actually making any changes to the greenhouse gas emissions in the world as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Saskatchewan Party have been very, very clear in this. It seems that this accord is more about politics than it is about science, like so many agreements, many international agreements. As I mentioned, it possibly could mean a transfer of millions and billions of dollars of capital to the underdeveloped world while not changing anything in the environmental file at all.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen the present Prime Minister of Canada push this accord on to the Canadian people. And what is the agenda of the present Liberal Prime Minister? Well he claims to . . . he has said he's going to be retiring in I believe a year from this February and he has made no secret that he wants to leave a legacy that he's going to leave with the Canadian people. And this is one of the areas where he's pushing hard where he thinks this is going to leave a positive legacy in the minds of historians into the future.

And unfortunately as we've seen in the past and the policy is made this way, that it hurts many people. It will have a negative effect on much of Canada — all in the name of a prime minister, a lame-duck prime minister, quite frankly, who may not last the full year into the future in politics. And we're going to be left with this very serious accord and Protocol which is going to hurt Canada, and Saskatchewan in particular.

So we also hear what the provincial Liberal Party has said. Well the provincial Liberal leader is supporting what the federal Liberals are doing, with no thought of their own and without any interest in protecting the Saskatchewan economy. He has just . . . he has done what he's been told by the federal counterparts and gone along.

Now yesterday we listened to the Liberal member in the legislature and he stood up and spoke for 20 minutes. But unfortunately after the end of his speech, no one is wiser to what his position is on Kyoto. It was left very hazy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the NDP's position on Kyoto has been very muddy at best. It's obvious that the NDP caucus is split over this. And we have seen the Premier . . . I'd like to quote from a CJME radio, October 7:

Premier Lorne Calvert says he can't oppose the Kyoto accord.

Well we have seen a couple of his members stand up and speak in favour of Kyoto. And so that's another sign of division in the NDP caucus and the NDP cabinet.

And we have noticed that the Premier of Saskatchewan has not spoke on the Kyoto accord and has not spoke in this debate. And one has to wonder why he has not come into the House. He still has some time before the vote this afternoon to speak on this accord, but I suspect he is too afraid to come in the House and speak his mind. His caucus is divided and I suspect he does not want to actually say anything about it and hope this situation goes away, but unfortunately will not.

Mr. Speaker, our leader, the Leader of the Official Opposition, the member from Rosetown-Biggar spoke yesterday, spoke very clearly about the Saskatchewan Party's policy on Kyoto, and I'd just like to read again the amendment to the motion:

... (The Saskatchewan Party supports) the 12 principles adopted by the provinces and territories as the basis for negotiating a made-in-Canada, made-in-Saskatchewan plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions that balances the important goal of protecting the environment with the equally critical need to get Saskatchewan's economy growing again.

Very clear. That is leadership, Mr. Speaker — something we do not see from the NDP Premier.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Before I enter the debate on Kyoto, I want to first of all congratulate the new member who was recently elected in the by-election in Kindersley. And I want to congratulate him on becoming a member of the Legislative Assembly. And I wish him much success as a member of the legislature, advocating on behalf of his constituents.

Mr. Speaker, over the past several months I've listened intently to the discussion around the Kyoto Protocol. And in fact, Mr. Speaker, I've been interested in this topic since about 1995. I must say I've heard alarming comments, both pro and con. I've seen ads in our daily newspapers, both pro and cons. And I've seen carefully crafted phrases to convince us one way or the other that either Kyoto is public enemy number one or it's a small step forward as the world attempts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Mr. Speaker, I've read everything that I can, from the work done by the Fraser Institute to the work of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. I've read various publications and scientific journals. And I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that there are many, many publications, including information coming from the Prairie Adaptation Research Collaborative or PARC.

I've also had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to meet with citizens who represent industry. And I've also met with a scientist in Saskatchewan who was the editor on the North American chapter of the Working Group number II of the

Intergovernmental chapter . . . or Panel on Climate Change; and this is chapter 15.

And this Working Group II assessed climate change, its impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability. Every sentence that was edited by this scientist was edited for scientific accuracy, and each sentence on the North American chapter and in the work contained was approved by international scientists. It was a highly rigorous exercise.

For my colleagues across the floor, all scientists that I've had an opportunity to meet with indicate that when they observe on these kinds of matters, they observe it in a rigorous way and they, as I understand it, tend to have quite a conservative culture.

In my review of the literature I concluded that it was most likely that the internationally recognized scientists have the greatest understanding of the issue of climate change. And in all of my research I also concluded that we all need to be worried about our ability and our capacity to understand the impacts on our citizens, our industry, and our globe, Mr. Speaker.

We've clearly heard from our opposition colleagues that they're opposed to signing the Kyoto Protocol. Clearly they do not understand the rate of change in our climate, which will be faster unless we act now.

So what does science know about climate change? For the 20th century, the global mean surface temperature has increased by about point six degrees Celsius. The northern hemispheric surface temperature has increased and it's increased greater than in any other century in the last 1,000 years.

The 1990s is the warmest decade of the last 1,000 years for the northern hemisphere. And for the western Prairies the snow cover season has been shrinking, especially in the last 30 years. There has been a widespread retreat of glaciers and it's occurring in the northern hemisphere. And glaciers are an important source of river flow for the Prairies.

Mr. Speaker, spring blooming dates for ash and poplar have shifted 26 days earlier in the past several decades in the Prairies. Global and regional climate changes are happening and they're happening now. Our ecosystems are changing as they are affected by climate change, and these changes are consistent with climate change projections.

Scientific analysis demonstrates that greenhouse gases are the dominant driver of climate changes in the past century. And a balance of evidence suggests that human activity does influence global climate. There is evidence that most of the global warming observed is due to human activity.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the International Panel on Climate Change 2001 has clearly observed that for the mid-latitude of the northern hemisphere, that our winter temperatures increase faster than our summer temperatures; night temperatures rise faster than daytime temperatures; soil moisture decreases in summer and increases in winter; snow cover area and duration decrease; and precipitation increases in winter with some decreases in the summer.

(15:30)

It is expected that there will be extreme weather. Whether that's hail, heat waves, cold spells, they'll decrease tornadoes and dust storms. Droughts and floods are going to increase and they're going to intensify.

Now what does that mean for the Prairies where we live? For the Prairies we can expect longer growing seasons. We can expect more extremes. We can expect decreased snow cover and spring recharge. We can expect water problems such as floods, drought, and conflicts over water. We can see the northern expansion of insects and disease, and we'll see more fires. And we'll see decreases in air, soil, and water quality. And, Mr. Speaker, we'll see these decreases sooner rather than later.

In Saskatchewan over 46 per cent of our land is under agricultural production and it's worth more than \$4 billion in exports. The prairie climate has had a history of being much more arid than the present-day climate. And given climate change, the arid nature of the Prairies and the environment on social and economic impacts produced by historic droughts, any change to the prairie climate that might increase its aridity could have serious ecological and financial consequences for our province. And any increase in temperature could have disastrous impacts on agriculture.

And we're seeing this already, Mr. Speaker, in the west-central part of our province and the northwest part of our province where many farmers have experienced drought five out of the last six years.

Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the public and the Assembly that all of the information that I've given you has scientific sources. Scientific sources for all of my observations, Mr. Speaker, are available if the opposition is interested.

And, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that projected climate change will have both beneficial and adverse effects on our social economic system. But let there be no doubt, the larger the change and the rate of change in climate, the adverse effects will be the most dominate.

So what do we do? We can pay lip service and carry on. But then we're going to need to adapt in response. We'll need to moderate the harm and it will be very costly. And I can say of all of my review of the literature, I have not seen any work done on the do-nothing option. This option, Mr. Speaker, will be highly disruptive and costly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm of the view that we need to do our part. Our government has done much work already which has been articulated by my colleague, the member from Saskatoon Greystone, who I believe — contrary to what the Leader of the Opposition has to say — that he knows more about Kyoto and its impacts than any other member of the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, we know from all of the work that's been done . . . And it's obvious to me from the members' opposite speeches, who I've read very carefully, that they have not done any work in terms of research. What they have simply done is parrot what is being said out of Alberta, Mr. Speaker.

We know that in southern Canada the largest increases in temperature due to greenhouse gas emissions are expected to occur in our province, on the Prairies. And we know that temperatures have increased significantly in the past several decades. We know that the Prairie provinces have a variable climate and we know that our economy and ecosystems are extremely sensitive to variation in climate.

We know that most of our population of Alberta and Saskatchewan derive their waters from glaciers and snowfields in the Rocky Mountains and we know that this source of water is declining. And many glaciers, Mr. Speaker, are expected to disappear in this century.

We know that more precipitation will fall as rain as opposed to snow, and we know that the timing of storage runoff will change requiring adaptation of water management practices.

We know that drier conditions on the Western Canadian boreal forest will increase fire frequency and intensity, and we've already witnessed that in the last couple of years.

And Prairie people, especially farmers who have had a large, a relatively large capacity to adapt to change because of a history of adaptation, will have to adapt to these periodic droughts and floods.

Mr. Speaker, and what does this mean? Well for those people in our province who are dependent upon agriculture — and we have over \$4 billion in exports — they are going to have to adapt even if we do something, and they will have to adapt even further if we do nothing.

We know that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change will emphasize the assessment of the interactions between climate change and water, and this work is going to be due in 2007. And we know already, given the work that was done around the Meridian dam, that there will be increased competition for water as many jurisdictions and sectors will compete and fight for water. And this will become a significant public issue.

And obviously economic growth will be affected by the availability of quality surface water. And for even those in the oil and gas industry, in order for that oil to be extracted, they need access to water. And as our climate changes, Mr. Speaker, that access is going to become more and more limited as we try and extract those fossil fuels.

So what are we to do? Well, Mr. Speaker, we can do nothing as I've said, or we can try and do something. And if you listen to the opposition, their view is: don't sign Kyoto, do nothing, and life will carry on. In fact, as I've listened to the opposition, it appears as though they don't even believe that the world is warming due to human consumption and human activity when it comes to CO₂ and nitrous oxide emissions.

Mr. Speaker, we have a host of information that has been made available to Canadians. We have a host of information that indicates very clearly that we need to move forward and we need to support the Kyoto Protocol. But we need to move forward in a way where Canadians and Saskatchewan people clearly understand what this means for them.

Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to have a group called the Sun Ridge development come to my home and do a greenhouse gas emissions test on my home. And while much has been spoken about in terms of industry's responsibilities and duty to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, not much has been said about we, as individual consumers, can do.

Mr. Speaker, my home was built in 1911; it's an old home in the city of Saskatoon. I have a relatively new furnace. I have a relatively new water heater. I have done some work in terms of insulating my attic and my basement. So I have been doing some things to try and deal with the whole issue of cost effectiveness when it comes to energy consumption, but also when it comes to making my home more comfortable.

Sun Ridge developments was able to show me, through the tests that they did on my home, that I can reduce my own greenhouse gas emissions in my house by 3 tonnes per annum. And I can do that — and also save myself \$640 based on today's present gas prices — I can do that by spending about \$4,000.

I can do further insulation work in my walls. I can do more work in terms of caulking my windows and my baseboards and making sure that my electrical outlets are properly insulated; by doing further insulation in my basement; by changing my water heater to a water heater that heats water as I use it; and also by changing some of my appliances, like my fridge. My fridge is 20 years old and it's not that energy efficient, Mr. Speaker. And there are now fridges available that can lower your electrical consumption, save you money, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

And, Mr. Speaker, what's so amazing is that hundreds of people are getting this kind of work done so that they can take some personal responsibility as we make our way towards those Kyoto Protocol targets, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I like about the government's resolution is that clearly we are committed to ensuring that Saskatchewan businesses, Saskatchewan citizens, the Saskatchewan economy is treated fairly and that we're not going to be penalized because we are blessed with some of Canada's resources — primary resources such as oil and gas, forestry, and elsewhere. And the resolution makes it very clear that we all need to be treated fairly as Canada moves towards the Kyoto Protocol targets come 2012, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other points that I would like to make but I would make these points to the people of this province. The Saskatchewan Party does not want to sign the Kyoto Protocol. They are against it. The Government of Saskatchewan supports the principles of the Kyoto Protocol and moving towards those 2012 targets. And we want to do it in a way where our citizens, our province, our socio-economic economy is treated fairly, Mr. Speaker.

For that reason, I will be opposing the amendment introduced by the members of the opposition where they stand opposed to Kyoto. And I will be supporting the motion put forward by my colleagues from P.A. (Prince Albert) and Athabasca where we support the 12-point plan and we support the principles of Kyoto in reaching those greenhouse gas emission reductions by the year 2012. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wall: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure to be able to participate in this debate on this very important resolution and the amendment put forward by the official opposition by the member for Thunder Creek.

Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks though, I do want to welcome and congratulate the new member for Kindersley — welcome him to our caucus and to this legislature. He has already acquitted himself very, very well in terms of the work that we do as a caucus, and including our committee work and indeed was able to participate in his first standing committee meeting of the Crown Corporations Committee two weeks ago where we were asking some important questions — some on Kyoto in fact that week when SaskPower officials were there. And it's certainly a pleasure for us to welcome him to the legislature in the first session of what will no doubt be a very long and rewarding career.

Mr. Speaker, when I was contemplating what it was that I wanted to add to this debate — and there's been much said; I've tried to listen closely to the comments from my own colleagues and from those of the government — but when contemplating what I would say today in regards to this resolution I did want to focus, Mr. Speaker, if I could, on the impact of this particular Protocol and the impact of this debate on my constituency.

Mr. Speaker, we're very fortunate in the constituency of Swift Current to have a very strong and vibrant oil and gas community. That particular sector of our economy in Swift Current contributes mightily to the success that we have. And even when times are a little thin — and for the most part those have been NDP times over the last 10 years — when times are a little thin in terms of the economy of Swift Current and area, we have at the least been able to rely on a strong and robust oil and gas sector.

Mr. Speaker, we have a number of entrepreneurs, oil and gas entrepreneurs who have chosen to make Swift Current a home and I should pay tribute to them at the outset of these remarks, Mr. Speaker. We've had some changes in our oil and gas industry of late.

For the most part by the way, Mr. Speaker, it's service companies, oil and gas service companies that we lay claim to in Swift Current and area. We'd like there to be more production companies in Swift Current and we're hopeful that with the changes that we'll be able to make, and because of the work of our energy critic, the member for Thunder Creek, that due to the changes we'll be able to make in government we may be able to attract some producers as well to join the many service companies that are in Swift Current.

I want to congratulate one company in particular that's the product of an acquisition or a merger. There were two very dynamic service companies in Swift Current. One was Diamond oil well servicing, headed up by some young and aggressive and very solid entrepreneurs — one of whom I went to school with in Swift Current, and moved away for a time to Alberta and has come back to operate an oil service company.

Mr. Speaker, I should point out that for Diamond, their head

office is in Swift Current and they have a shop in Medicine Hat as well. So there's a company doing work in Alberta.

(15:45)

The other . . . there's many, but probably the other major service company is a company called Sage Oil Well Services — and they've been in Swift Current for years and years — started by a number of individuals and not the least were Ted Hanlon and Len Stein, who was also the mayor of Swift Current for some considerable period of time.

Anyway, those two companies have come together to form a very strong and dynamic oil servicing company. And that particular new company and many, and I would say almost all of the other oil and gas service companies in Swift Current, are very, very, very concerned about the Kyoto Protocol. They are paying attention to the debate here. And of course they were paying disappointed but close attention to the vote yesterday in the House of Commons to ratify the accord.

Mr. Speaker, they are the employer of so many young people, the employers of so many young people in our community. I take a look at the parents of many of the friends of my children in elementary school, and so many of them are working either indirectly or directly as a result of the presence of a strong oil and gas sector in our community.

So when the Kyoto accord debate ramped up in the country and when it became clear that this government was going to be sending mixed messages on the issue, I made a point of contacting them, as many of those oil and gas service companies I could by way of a letter. And I just highlighted what it was we knew about the Kyoto Protocol and about its failings, and also about this government's position on the accord.

And I enclosed with that letter a petition and encouraged them to have that petition signed by employees or friends or themselves, if they had a concern. And I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, the response has been overwhelming — the number of petitions we have received in our office and have had the chance to present them in this legislature, at least a few them.

And their concerns are the concerns that you've heard from this side of the House. Their concerns though also, Mr. Speaker, are the concerns that you heard raised even by our Minister of Industry in the province — concerns I would say not shared frankly by many of his caucus colleagues, but concerns that he has made a valiant effort to try to put forward in this debate and in handling this particular file as a minister.

In the letter that I sent out to our oil and gas people in Swift Current, Mr. Speaker, we began the letter by highlighting . . . or rather we ended the letter I think is how it turned out in the end, by highlighting a quote from a CBC (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation) Saskatchewan Web site dated October 28, 2002. And CBC was trying to characterize where the Premier stands on the issue of Kyoto. And I'm quoting their Web site, Mr. Speaker. Their Web site says:

Calvert says he supports Kyoto in principle. Calvert says he does not support Alberta's court challenge to Ottawa's

proposed ratification of the deal.

Combine that statement with the fact that the previous speaker, the member for Nutana, came out in the *Leader-Post* and *The StarPhoenix*, I believe on October 18, strongly supporting and calling on her government to ratify Kyoto, and she was joined in that position by the member for Greystone.

How in the world can the oil and gas community of this province, those that create so many jobs, those that attract so much investment, those that pay so many taxes — corporate income taxes and capital taxes and are the reason why employees can pay income tax and sales tax — how in the world can those oil and gas companies have any comfort at all with this government that they are united with respect to the need to send out a strong signal of support for their industry when senior members of their caucus, members who have been in the NDP cabinet, come out and say that Kyoto is fine; ratify it — take the blind leap of faith, notwithstanding that we don't know how this will be implemented — notwithstanding any of that, ratify it. That's what those members said.

Combine that with what the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan said, which is that he likes Kyoto in principle and that he wouldn't join any sort of a court challenge put forward by the province of Alberta and then ask yourself, Mr. Speaker, why those business men and women in this province, in my hometown, with all of their employees, would have any faith at all that an NDP government was interested in their issue, was interested in defending them, that an NDP government was prepared to fight for them. Mr. Speaker, they don't believe it. That's why they signed the petition.

Our petition basically calls on this government to stiffen its resolve. But as you've heard from the previous speaker, far from that this NDP government is very wishy-washy on this issue.

And it isn't the only oil and gas issue they've been wishy-washy on. You know, Mr. Speaker, earlier this fall the Minister of Industry made an announcement about oil royalties. And the original announcement I think portrayed something much greater than what we actually got, but nonetheless you could argue that in some respects it was a step in the right direction and to that extent the opposition said . . . gave the minister credit.

But do you know what happened shortly after that, Mr. Speaker? The same member that just spoke, the member from Nutana, again commented in the media that . . . or at least questioned the wisdom of cutting royalties in the oil and gas sector, once again sending the mixed message to the oil and gas industry in Swift Current and in southwest Saskatchewan and across the province. And the mixed message is, is that there's one minister — apparently one minister — that's prepared to recognize the importance of this industry and maybe fight for it, although now he's going to be supporting a very much watered down NDP resolution. But at least they would have had some hope before.

And then all of the other comments, including the Premier's comments and comments from senior members of the legislature from that side of the House, that would give the

industry in Swift Current every reason to believe that this government doesn't feel comfortable in its support of the oil and gas industry. And we see it time and time again.

We also see it on the issue of uranium, frankly. On one hand you have some members paying lip service to companies like COGEMA and Cameco. But we know, Mr. Speaker, that members across the way, senior members across the way would rather that the province had nothing to do with the development of uranium. They would rather that the province had nothing to do with the jobs and the economic impact that can come from that industry.

We've had mixed messages from this government. They pay lip service on one hand to the industry. But we know that the left wing of their party that frankly seems to be running the show these days, including on the issue of Kyoto, that send the mixed messages to the people of the province.

And that's also why, Mr. Speaker, even though they've heard from the Minister of Industry and others, that's why the oil and gas industry in this province doesn't trust them. They don't trust them, Mr. Speaker. That's why areas that have the oil and gas industry in their constituencies vote for the Saskatchewan Party, Mr. Speaker; that's why they're going to continue to vote for the Saskatchewan Party — because they don't trust them.

This government appears very willing to cash the cheques that the oil and gas industry sends in. You know, Mr. Speaker, in . . . since 1998, Swift Current area, the southwest area as defined by Energy and Mines or what used to be Energy and Mines, sent in \$80 million in land sales revenue to this government . . . 80 . . . it was about \$88 million.

You know what they're starting to ask now, Mr. Speaker, after sending all of these cheques in to this NDP government, helping them to balance . . . or at least at one point balance their budget, but helping to keep their deficit to about a half a billion dollars? After all of that, Mr. Speaker, they're wondering why in the world is this government sending mixed messages on Kyoto when the government understands what it could do to that industry, Mr. Speaker. They understand what this accord will do to the industry.

Well the Minister of the Environment says there are no mixed messages. Then why won't he and his colleagues stand up and send a united message that they oppose the ratification of Kyoto, Mr. Speaker? Why don't they support our amendment? All he's got to do is stand up and vote for our amendment then and that would be a clear message to the oil and gas industry that we oppose . . . they oppose the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol.

He can't have it both ways. He can't snipe from the sidelines, Mr. Speaker, and say there is no mixed message while his Premier, the member from Nutana, and the member for Greystone send out mixed messages to the industry. He can't have it both ways, Mr. Speaker.

And if you want to get an idea, Mr. Speaker, there was a letter to the editor in *The Southwest Booster* called "Kyoto and needed action". That's our local paper and it's about Kyoto. And the author of this letter, Mr. Speaker, by all accounts,

apparently is considering or is already a candidate for the NDP nomination, the provincial nomination.

And here's what he says, Mr. Speaker. He frankly thinks that Kyoto should be ratified. He agrees with the member for Greystone and the member for Nutana and other members of the NDP that think it should simply be ratified. In his letter, Mr. Speaker, here's how he characterizes those who are very wary of Kyoto, who don't agree that we should ratify the accord. And I quote. He says:

The short-sighted, myopic view of conservative fossil fuel dinosaurs like Wall are little more than the traditional opposition to change that will benefit humanity.

Fossil fuel dinosaurs, Mr. Speaker. So I guess this young NDP individual isn't just referring to myself. I guess he's referring to the very same oil and gas companies, the same entrepreneurs that every day risk dollars and risk investment to create jobs and to bring taxes to the government's treasury. They're all fossil fuel dinosaurs, Mr. Speaker.

If you want to get to the truth of what this government thinks of the oil and gas sector, it's right here in this letter. They think that they're fossil fuel dinosaurs. They're happy to cash the cheques and keep their deficit to about a half a billion dollars by cashing their cheques. They're happy to take \$88 million out of Swift Current in land sales alone, Mr. Speaker; and by the way, not return even a single dime towards a new hospital — not a single dime. They're happy to do that. But here's what they think of them. They think that they're fossil fuel dinosaurs.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you this side of the House understands that those men and women that are creating those jobs and paying those taxes are the only reason in this . . . one of the only reasons that we still have a chance in this province to recover from six decades of socialism. That's what we understand on this side of the House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wall: — Mr. Speaker, I think other colleagues have highlighted as well the impact of Kyoto in terms of our electricity bill, that bills will increase by 25 per cent or more. Mr. Speaker, they understand that IPSCO's talking about leaving the province of Saskatchewan and moving to the province of Alberta.

And you know, Mr. Speaker, I think they also understand that Kyoto could cost, according to studies, every family \$2,700 per year. And I also think people do understand that we need, we do need to take a look at the issue of greenhouse gases. We do need a made-in-Canada and a made-in-Saskatchewan solution. We do need to be serious about the issue.

But, Mr. Speaker, what they also need to hear from their government is that the government understands that killing the goose that's laying the only golden egg they've got going for them right now is no way to afford, for government to afford the kinds of environmental measures that can in fact meaningfully clean up the environment here in Saskatchewan and across Canada.

And so, Mr. Speaker, because it would . . . because the Kyoto Protocol holds so much potential harm and danger for my constituents, the people who gave me their trust to represent their views, I will be supporting the amendment that was put forward by the member for Thunder Creek and seconded by the member of Carrot River Valley. And, Mr. Speaker, because it's a wishy-washy, indefinite statement from the government, I will be opposing the NDP's resolution on this issue.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion and will be opposing the amendment.

This morning, Mr. Speaker, I was approached by an individual at an institution here in Regina and he said, you know, I just don't know what to make of this Kyoto matter, this Kyoto business; I don't understand it.

And I might say that's not a unique sentiment in Regina or for that matter in Saskatchewan. I think one of the other members of the House, the member from Arm River, said as much last night when he said:

As I travel around my constituency it's almost 100 per cent of the people that are against Kyoto, basically because they don't know what's going on.

(16:00)

And this gentleman too, he wasn't expressing opposition. He was just expressing the sentiment that he was not familiar with the issue and did not know what was going on.

I didn't get much time to reply. He was busy; I was busy. But I would like to make some comments now and if you like, Mr. Speaker, if I might be taken . . . take that liberty of addressing my comments as much to him as I might be addressing them to the Chair.

To me Kyoto is about science and it's about climate. And that's not to say that I know much about science, Mr. Speaker. I didn't take physics in high school and I'm no scientist. There's times I wish I had taken physics in high school, but I'm no scientist. But then we're not elected to be experts in subjects in this Legislative Assembly. That's not the nature of elected representation. There are very few experts inside this Legislative Assembly.

We do tend, however, to rely on the words of and the evidence of authorities that's presented to us, whether it's people in the provincial government administration or whether it's other authorities. We need to take their words, we need to take their evidence and then make what we'd like to call informed decisions that are in the best interests of the public.

And what we bring to this is, hopefully, some sense of maturity or wisdom so that we, at the end of the day, make the right decision. That's not to say we always make the right decision. That's not to say that the so-called informed matters that are

brought for us by experts are always the right matters or the right information, but it's up to us to try and make the right decisions.

I think Tommy Douglas probably said that best some years back when there was some exchange in this very Chamber, and he said something to the effect that, you know, I don't have to be a chicken to know how to make an omelette, Mr. Speaker. And I guess in this Kyoto matter it's something like . . . it's similar. I'm not a scientist but I have to nevertheless make decisions about something that is, at the end of the day, a scientific matter and a scientific matter about the climate.

What do I know, Mr. Speaker? I know that the overwhelming majority of scientists agree, the overwhelming majority — and the words that are used sometimes is the preponderance of evidence — they agree that in part the earth's temperature is increasing, the climate is warming because of man-made greenhouse gas emissions, largely carbon dioxide and methane, Mr. Speaker. And these scientists say we have to reduce these emissions if we want to slow down or hopefully reverse global warming, Mr. Speaker. And again, it's the overwhelming majority of scientists that are saying that.

That's not to say that there aren't scientists who take a different point of view. I think that just about in every endeavour in the world that you can think of where scientists become involved, there will be various points of view expressed by scientists. But in this case, the overwhelming majority agree.

And again, that's not to say that there aren't scientists who take a different point of view. I think even if you were to say that, for example, that everyone would agree, or most doctors would agree, that babies come to us because they're delivered by a nurse and a doctor and a mother's involved, there will still be somebody in this world, Mr. Speaker, who'll take the point of view that no, babies are delivered by a stork. Well those would be the funny science people, Mr. Speaker, but there would be somebody.

I think even some years after Columbus and then others who sailed around the world, there were still people who believed, no, the earth was flat. And in fact there may well be people today who believe that the earth is flat. So I say that by way of saying that no matter what the overwhelming evidence is on something, there will always be somebody who disagrees, Mr. Speaker.

But in this particular case, it is very, very clear that there is a consensus in the world scientific community that the great majority of scientists agree that global warming is an issue and that we should do something about that.

Why is it a problem? You know it's hard today, Mr. Speaker, and I've got to admit that I'm feeling a little ambivalent about global warming when you have a beautiful day like we have today where it's, I think in Regina plus 5 degrees. And it's at least I looked . . . the last time I looked it was a beautiful, sunny day. So I've got to confess, there are days that I'm a little ambivalent about global warming. And who wouldn't be ambivalent when you get falls that are much nicer, you get shorter winters, the winter is a much nicer winter.

But at the end of the day the problem is that we know from the scientists that if this trend continues that the earth's oceans will rise, that there will be flooding in global cities around the world, as one example. We know, for example, from their scientific evidence that areas such as Saskatchewan would turn into desert. And I don't know whether the droughts of the last two years are part of a trend that's moving us in that direction, that might be something else. But again that's the scientific evidence.

So even though all of us might wish for nicer winters, Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that the global warming will result in horrendous, horrendous problems for all of us. And that I think we would agree that if we knew or that we know that because of global warming Saskatchewan will become a desert over years and if there's a way that we can act to prevent that, that we would do that, Mr. Speaker.

So I accept the conclusions and the call to action by the world scientific community who say there is a problem, you need to do something, you need to act responsibly. Again, I wish it weren't so but the fact remains that this is an issue and we need to act.

Mr. Speaker, you know at the end of the day I'm elected here to make responsible decisions. And in making those responsible decisions I have to rely on the evidence that's presented to me and I have to rely on the information that's presented to me so I can make informed decisions in a responsible manner, Mr. Speaker. And that's what I plan to do.

I accept the science. My colleagues on this side of the House, I think those that have spoken to it also accept the science that says that we do have a problem with greenhouse gas emission. So I think it's a legitimate question for people at home to say well what is this all about? It is a legitimate question for them to ask decision makers and their elected representatives, do you accept the scientific consensus that there is a problem that needs to be fixed? Yes or no? No maybes, yes or no? Do you agree that there is a problem that needs to be fixed?

I am particularly interested, given this question, as to what it is that people on the other side of the House are saying because they've also been involved in this debate. And there, I'm not so sure that they agree that there is even a problem. Because almost all of their speakers who have spoken to this issue try to somehow minimize that there is a problem. Their very first speaker, the member for Thunder Creek, Mr. Speaker, in his remarks he doesn't say . . . what he says is that the scientific community cannot even agree as to whether or not any global warming is occurring outside of normal cyclic temperature swings or if so, if it is man made or caused by natural events.

Well that's not what the scientific community as a whole is saying. Some scientists may be saying that, but the great majority of scientists are not saying that, Mr. Speaker. So now he's saying that that's what's guiding his intervention in this debate, that there is really no problem that needs to be fixed.

Their next speaker on this, the member for Carrot River Valley, he doesn't agree that there's a problem. He says there is no consensus, Mr. Speaker, on the theory that humanity is causing significant climate change. So he doesn't agree that there's any

problem that's being caused by us. So if he doesn't agree that there's any problem, I'm not sure why it is that he would even want to speak to the solution that's put before us, Mr. Speaker.

One of their other speakers, the member for Humboldt, she doesn't even say . . . she doesn't even say or even address the question of any, any problem whatsoever. She just launches into a diatribe or an attack on the government, Mr. Speaker.

Now the member for Arm River, the member for Arm River, he says that global warming itself, basically the scientific community is split 50/50 on whether there is . . . if this will even address the problem with that. They're split right down the centre on that.

Well that's not my understanding and that's not the understanding of anybody, Mr. Speaker, that seriously examines this issue. Again, the scientific community is very, very clear on this. There is a problem. It needs to be fixed. It's man made and the solutions have to be man made as well, Mr. Speaker. This is not, this is not a question of the scientific community being split. Again there are some specific scientists who always take a contrarian position and that's the science that I guess members of the opposition subscribe to — the so-called funny science people, Mr. Speaker.

And it goes on. The member for Kindersley who in his maiden speech . . . and I want to congratulate the member for Kindersley both on his election and also on what I thought was a well organized and well delivered presentation, although I disagree with some of his points. He too says he questions the validity of the science. He said the third point focuses on the validity of the scientists and in this, in this the scientific community is split on. Well I don't think they're split on this, Mr. Speaker. I think again the great majority of opinion in the scientific community is we have a problem and the problem is man made. And there has to be man-made solutions to this, Mr. Speaker.

And then we get to the member for Estevan. She says scientists don't agree. They can't assure us that there is a trend to global warming. So she too denies that there is a problem. In fact she goes so far as to say Kyoto does not deal with pollution, it deals with greenhouse gas emissions. Now I'm not sure how to make that distinction myself, Mr. Speaker, but I guess she does that.

And then we go on further, Mr. Speaker, as we listened last night to the Leader of the Opposition. And the Leader of the Opposition did not mention the science whatsoever, not once, not at all did he say there is a problem, or there isn't a problem, here's where I come down on the problem. He didn't mention it. He just launched into a diatribe, an attack on anyone who is opposed to his point of view. And he said, in fact, this is not a debate about being environmentally responsible and then launched into an attack heaping scorn on others who might have something to say, using words such as fanatical, misguided, ridiculous, ridiculous again, radical, not being honest.

And I might say, Mr. Speaker, I've been here a few years now and you might say I've been around the block a few times and I have seen a fair number of party leaders in my day, Mr. Speaker, make interventions in this House. But I daresay I have never seen such an intervention by a party leader that was so

shallow, Mr. Speaker, and that was so negative, as I witnessed last night by the Leader of the Opposition.

And I'd say it's not a very helpful intervention. It's not something that helps us deal with what is, we believe, scientifically proven a major issue for us, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, I agree that there is a problem. And I guess the question I would have and the people of Saskatchewan would have, how can you talk about what solution you will or will not agree to, whether it's Kyoto or made in Saskatchewan, if you don't think that there is a problem.

If they don't believe there is a problem, then why would they address themselves as to what the solution should be, Mr. Speaker. And it seems to me, in this particular case, they're trying to have it both ways, if you like, resolutely riding off in both directions.

They say on the one hand well, you know, we don't like the solution that's put forward, we need to have a different kind of solution; but oh, if we're really pressed, we don't even agree that there is a problem. And I want to make that clear because there are many, many people both in Saskatchewan, throughout Canada, and in the world that will be interested to know that notwithstanding what it is that the majority of scientific evidence suggests, they do not believe it one bit whatsoever. They don't believe there is a problem. We can simply continue on the way we are; that whatever is happening — climate change that man made — is not sort of part of their lexicon, is not part of their vocabulary, Mr. Speaker.

(16:15)

But this is what the opposition typically does. They try to sit on both sides of the fence or as I said they resolutely ride off in both directions at the same time. Here they say, well we — you know, in all their speeches — we don't agree with the signs, we don't think there is a problem. But yet here their resources critic, the member for Thunder Creek, writes to the Prime Minister and he says the official opposition Saskatchewan Party supports the goal of the Kyoto accord to reduce atmospheric greenhouse gas concentrations but then goes on to say, of course we want you to reconsider the government's position on the Kyoto accord and we oppose what you're trying to do.

So here again they're trying to have it one way, trying to have it another way, trying to have it every which way. But again I guess I just don't understand. If you don't agree that there is a problem, if you don't agree that there is a problem then how can you get fixed on what the solution should be, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, in this particular issue I dare say that there is much to be done. Much has been done. The provincial government has been taking action over the course of the last years and months. We have moved with greater urgency in the area of energy conservation to see what we can do to help institutions to conserve energy because if you conserve energy that's something that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

We have moved in the area of ethanol, Mr. Speaker, to develop an ethanol industry and at the end of the day to have a situation in Saskatchewan where ethanol will be an additive in all of our gasoline because we know if we do that we can also

significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

We have moved, and people will know, in the area of wind power. And I hope that we see more of that in that particular area. And there are other areas that we have moved in, Mr. Speaker.

Individually there are things that we can do in our own homes, whether it's turning off some lights, whether it's getting a thermostat that turns down the heat automatically at night and during the day when we're not at home. There are many, many things that we can do and people can get information from many sources that we can do on an individual basis.

There is much debate about the impact of this accord and what it might potentially have on the Saskatchewan and Canadian economies. And we've heard a great deal of that, I think, from both sides of the House.

I might add though that it's not always negative to say that trying to conserve energy means that there will be job losses because I just mentioned ethanol and we know that jobs will be created in the area of ethanol. But ethanol will also help us to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. So there is an example of where you reduce greenhouse gas emissions, you help the environment, but at the same time you're creating more jobs.

Mr. Speaker, we are taking the position that we are . . . we think we need to work with Ottawa and the provinces. We put forward a number of principles to do that. Those principles were in fact put forward by Saskatchewan. But again, Mr. Speaker, we want to do what's best for Saskatchewan, but again we also accept that there is a problem.

And I guess this debate is essentially about, yes we agree there is a problem. And if we agree there is a problem, how is it that we should move forward to work with Ottawa and the other provinces to see what would be the best solution, not only for Canada but also for Saskatchewan and in a way that minimizes the impact on the Saskatchewan economy, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, they say that if you agree if that there is a problem with global warming, that we need to . . . that if you accept the fact of Kyoto and the Kyoto accord, that somehow you're a socialist, Mr. Speaker. Well all I can say if acting responsibly means you're a socialist, Mr. Speaker, then I guess I would have to say that I too am a socialist, Mr. Speaker. And I will be voting in favour of the motion and opposed to the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Hart: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I certainly have looked forward to entering the debate on this important issue. Mr. Speaker, as many members of this Assembly have said during the last two days, this is a very complex but a very important issue.

It deals with having countries of the world, citizens of our country and of our province having to make decisions on . . . based on imperfect science — science that is . . . suggests that something is happening in the climate and also there is some evidence that it just may be a natural occurrence. And so as I said, it is certainly difficult to make some decisions that will have long-lasting and significant effects on our country and on

our province.

The other complexity to this issue, Mr. Speaker, is that the benefits of the decisions we make around the world, we really won't see those benefits for another 50 to 100 years. And to further complicate things, it's fairly difficult to determine the impact of doing nothing.

So, Mr. Speaker, from a personal standpoint, I've grappled with these issues and I have read as much as I possibly could on the issue. I've done research. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I hired some additional staff to do some research for me so that I could be informed on the issue.

And I guess when it comes down to whether you believe the science and that sort of thing and where you come down on this whole issue, you have to look at it in as unbiased a manner as you possibly can and then you also have to look at some of the personal decisions or from a personal side.

And, Mr. Speaker, last night I had the occasion to introduce three of our grandchildren and some of my remarks will be in that context. I really don't think, in my lifetime, if I should live to be the average life of a Saskatchewan citizen, that I will see a lot of damaging effects from climate change. But the question is what kind of a world will I leave for my grandchildren, Mr. Speaker, and that is something that has perplexed me.

I realize our time is short and I have a lot of information. So I think I will just basically cut through it and get to the points that I feel is important, because many of the things that I had intended to say, Mr. Speaker, have already been said by other members.

The way I view this whole debate on Kyoto, there's really three parts to it, in my opinion. The one portion that has been debated and continues to be debated in the country and within the province is: should Canada ratify the Kyoto Protocol? That's one debate. And really I think, Mr. Speaker, it's really kind of a moot debate because our federal government, our cabinet has decided that Canada will ratify and we will be part of the international treaty.

The second part of this whole issue is the federal implementation plan and that certainly is not a moot point. It is a very important point because that is . . . now that our federal government has decided to implement, to ratify the treaty, there is a whole lot of questions. There's many issues surrounding the federal government's implementation plan.

And the third point, the third issue in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, is that at some point we in this province have to face reality. And we have a couple of choices. We can say, well we're going to continue to fight the federal government's decision and devote all our energies in that arena; or we can face reality and say, okay, now that they've decided to ratify, maybe we should devote some of our energies to get the best deal possible for Saskatchewan. And I think that is very important, Mr. Speaker.

Basically I think to understand this whole area we have to talk a little bit about what Kyoto is, and we've heard many explanations from members on both sides of the House. I think probably the only thing that I could contribute at this point in

time is the common belief and the common statements that have been made is that Canada . . . that the Kyoto agreement has called on countries to reduce their greenhouse gases by 5 per cent below their 1990 levels. And in fact countries actually negotiated different targets — Canada being 6 per cent, the US (United States) actually negotiated a 7 per cent, and the EU (European Union) an 8 per cent, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to say a few words around this whole issue of climate change and is it for real. And I think in order to do that I would like to look at some recent events and then look at some of the statistical evidence that's out there in the world of science. I have made a point, Mr. Speaker, of asking groups that I encounter whether they feel the sun has more intensity now than it had, say, some 10 or 15 years ago. And it was interesting. I just completed a series of meetings with municipal councils and I asked that question and invariably people agreed, Mr. Speaker.

There is a fair bit of science out there that says this climate change is for real. And, Mr. Speaker, I think if you look at it in an unbiased fashion I think the scientific evidence, at least from my opinion, I believe that there is something to global warming; and something that I think the international panel on climate change, I think they got it right. I believe President Bush asked the US National Academy of Sciences to review that panel's work and they came back and reported to the president that by and large they had it right, that human activity is having an effect on our climate.

Mr. Speaker, I realize my time is somewhat short so I think I will forego some of the points I was going to make, except to say that in my opinion the recently unveiled federal implementation plan, I don't believe is cast in stone. I believe that there is some room for negotiation. And I would . . . And that would bring me to what my concerns are, Mr. Speaker.

This implementation plan will . . . if we look at it from the Saskatchewan viewpoint, there will be some additional costs. There could . . . there will be some lost opportunities, perhaps some job losses, and definitely extra costs to the citizens of Saskatchewan. But I think, Mr. Speaker, that there also is the flip side to that coin or at least there could be a flip side to that coin, and I think there could be some benefits, Mr. Speaker.

And one of those areas where I think there could be some very significant benefits is in that whole area of agricultural carbon sinks. But, Mr. Speaker, that is a very complex issue. And my real fear is that no one on that side of the House really understands the issue, nobody's on top of that issue, and nobody is in Ottawa negotiating with the federal government to make sure that the farmers of this province, in fact the farmers of Western Canada, gain the benefits of that particular issue. And I'm sure there are other issues. I just point that one out.

And, Mr. Speaker, my real fear is that this NDP government is going to drop the ball on that issue. And as I said, that is only one issue in this whole debate and I'm sure there are others. My fear is that, that if we look at where this government has been and this whole issue, they haven't participated in any of the conference of the parties. Other provinces like Quebec and Alberta had representatives there, making sure that their provincial viewpoint was part of the Canadian position. Even

Manitoba sent delegates to the conference of the parties. As far as I know, Saskatchewan hasn't done anything, Mr. Speaker.

And I think what we're really looking for . . . My biggest fear, and I hope it doesn't come to pass, is that we're going to end up with another situation like we did with the farm program AIDA (Agricultural Income Disaster Assistance), where this government said it's a federal issue; it's a federal responsibility; we don't want anything to do with it. And we as Saskatchewan citizens had to deal with the effect of that, Mr. Speaker.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would urge this government to get on . . . to get up to speed, to make sure that Saskatchewan's interests are represented and that we get the best possible deal we possibly can. If we're forced to live with this agreement, Mr. Speaker, we better make sure we get the most out of it, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

(16:30)

The division bells rang from 16:34 until 16:40.

Amendment negated on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 22

Kwiatkowski	Heppner	Draude
Gantefoer	Bjornerud	Toth
Wakefield	Stewart	Elhard
Eagles		

The Speaker: — Order, please. Order.

McMorris	D'Autremont	Bakken
Wall	Huyghebaert	Dearborn
Brkich	Wiberg	Weekes
Harpauer	Hart	Allchurch

Nays — 31

Calvert	Addley	Atkinson
Hagel	Lautermilch	Serby
Melenchuk	Cline	Sonntag
Osika	Lorjé	Kasperski
Goulet	Van Mulligen	Prebble
Belanger	Crofford	Axworthy
Nilson	Junor	Hamilton
Harper	Forbes	Jones
Higgins	Trew	Wartman
Thomson	Yates	McCall
Hillson		

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The division bells rang from 16:43 until 16:44.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 31

Calvert	Addley	Atkinson
Hagel	Lautermilch	Serby
Melenchuk	Cline	Sonntag

Osika	Lorjé	Kasperski
Goulet	Van Mulligen	Prebble
Belanger	Crofford	Axworthy
Nilson	Junor	Hamilton
Harper	Forbes	Jones
Higgins	Trew	Wartman
Thomson	Yates	McCall
Hillson		

Nays — 22

Kwiatkowski	Heppner	Draude
Gantefoer	Bjornerud	Toth
Wakefield	Stewart	Elhard
Eagles	McMorris	D'Autremont
Bakken	Wall	Huyghebaert
Dearborn	Brkich	Wiberg
Weekes	Harpauer	Hart
Allchurch		

The Assembly adjourned at 16:47.